00023588

NOT TO BE ISSUED OUT
WITHOUT PERMISSION.

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

THE RIGHT REV.

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE D.D.

VOL. I

LONDON : PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

LIFE

OF

THE RIGHT REVEREND

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD AND AFTERWARDS
OF WINCHESTER

WITH SELECTIONS FROM

HIS DIARIES AND CORRESPONDENCE

23588 ac

By A. R. ASHWELL, M.A.

LATE CANON OF THE CATHEDRAL
AND PRINCIPAL OF THE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, CHICHESTER

IN THREE VOLUMES—VOL. I.

Portrait

LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET
1880

All rights reserved

00023588

PREFACE.

As the eldest surviving son of Bishop Wilberforce, to whom he left all his letters and papers, I wish to say a word of preface to this history of his life. Canon Ashwell, at my request, and by the advice of many of my Father's oldest friends, has undertaken the arduous task of biographer. For various reasons I should have preferred delaying the publication for some years, but I have yielded to the pressing solicitations of many whose opinions I felt myself bound to respect.

It has not been my desire, as it certainly would have been most repugnant to his feelings, for my Father to be represented as a faultless hero. His life is no private biography. From the close of the year 1845 to the year 1873, it is really a part of the annals of the Church of England, as well as the Memoir of Bishop Wilberforce. It is in this spirit that this Life has been undertaken : it is in this spirit that it is given to the world. But it is equally certain that the true story of his life cannot be told without setting forth a great example, and without exhibiting a character of single-minded devotion to his country, to his Church, and above all to his Master.

While these pages were passing through the press, and only two days after the final revision of them had been completed, the lamented death of Canon Ashwell deprived this 'Life' of its biographer, and myself as well as many others of a very dear friend. He left this volume (with one or two trifling exceptions) as it goes before the public; some letters arranged and notes made for the two next volumes, but alas! nothing written. Whoever the future biographer is, I trust he will follow the scheme of the 'Life' as it is sketched out in the Introductory Chapter. I cannot, however, let this part of his work be published without saying how deeply I feel Canon Ashwell's almost irreparable loss, for with him the labour of the last four years was indeed a labour of love; it is a matter of deep regret to me that he did not live to complete his work.

R. G. WILBERFORCE.

LAVINGTON HOUSE:
Nov. 26, 1879.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION xiii

CHAPTER I.

(1805–23.)

BOYHOOD AND SCHOOL-LIFE.

Birth, Parentage, and Family Details—Singular Pains bestowed by his Father on his early Training—Tutors—The Intimacy between Mr. W. Wilberforce and the Sargent Family—Selections from the Letters of his Father to Samuel Wilberforce—Advice respecting his mode of Life at the University 1

CHAPTER II.

(1823–30.)

COLLEGE LIFE AND FIRST CURACY.

College Life and Friends—'The United Debating Society:' particulars of Samuel Wilberforce's Speeches and Opinions—Degree—Foreign Tour during the Summer and Autumn of 1827—Letters written during this Tour—Marriage—Ordination—Curacy and Life at Checkendon—Offer by the Bishop of Chester of the Rectory of Ribchester declined—The Bishop's Letter to Mr. Wilberforce on the subject—Offer by the Bishop of Winchester of the Rectory of Brighstone, Isle of Wight, accepted . . . 26

CHAPTER III.

(1830–35.)

FIRST YEARS AT BRIGHSTONE.

Removal to Brighstone—Mode of Life, Friends, Reading, and Parochial Work—State of Political Feeling in the Country—'The Note-book of a Country Clergyman'—Visit to Bishop of Winchester in London—Extracts from Diary—Preaches Sermon at

PAGE

Bishop of Winchester's Visitation—Offer of Incumbency of the Tunbridge Wells Chapel—Begins, in conjunction with his Brother Robert, the Life of William Wilberforce—Offer from Mr. C. Simeon of the Rectory of St. Dunstan's in the West, London—Speech at Meeting of the 'Friends of the Church' at Newport, I.W.—Parliamentary Elections of January 1835—Speech at Nomination of Candidates at Newport, I.W.—Severe Illness—Strong Affection entertained by Bishop of Winchester for him—Extracts from Diary—Visits paid to Friends in the Summer of 1835—Letters 51

CHAPTER IV.

(1836-38.)

LIFE AT BRIGHSTONE—(continued).

Visits to Oxford—Opposition to Appointment of Dr. Hampden as Regius Professor of Divinity—Letters—Account of a Visit from Irvingites—Work at his Father's Life—Long Visit to London—Extracts from Diaries—Offer of the Vicarage of Leeds—Speech at Public Meeting at Winchester—Sermon at Southampton advocating Missionary Bishops—Extracts from Diary—Letters—Offer of Exchange to Leamington First Sermon as Select Preacher at Oxford—In London—Extracts from Diary—Letter on Mr. J. H. Newman's Book on 'Justification'—The Queen's Coronation—Intercourse with Mr. Trench—Mr. J. H. Newman declines his further Contributions to the 'British Critic'—Dr. Hook's Sermon, 'Hear the Church'—Letters—Publication of the Life of Mr. Wilberforce—Letter to Mr. Gladstone with Presentation Copy—Mr. Gladstone's Reply 91

CHAPTER V.

(1839-40.)

LAST YEARS AT BRIGHSTONE.

Multitude of Engagements beyond his own Parish—Strong attachment to Brighstone—Publication of University Sermons, of 'Eucharistica,' and of 'Agathos'—Acquaintance with Bunsen, Carlyle, and Maurice—The Sterling Club—His S. P. G.' Tour in Devon and Cornwall—Appointed to Archdeaconry of Surrey—Letters—Publishes 'Letter to Lord Brougham' on the Education Question—Great Speech at the Mansion House for S. P. G.—Also

PAGE

at the Anti-Slavery Meeting at Exeter Hall — Appointed to Canonry in Winchester Cathedral — Appointed to Rectory of Alverstoke — Nominated as Bampton Lecturer for 1841 — His Primary Charge as Archdeacon of Surrey 137

CHAPTER VI.

(Jan. 1841—Oct. 1844.)

ALVERSTOKE.

Account of Alverstoke at time of Archdeacon Wilberforce's Appointment—His Work there—Appointed Chaplain to Prince Albert—Death of his Wife—Its lasting Effects upon his Mind—Extracts from Letters and Diaries respecting it—Contest for Poetry Professorship at Oxford—Letters—The Jerusalem Bishopric—The Anti-Corn Law League—Letters—First Sermon before the Queen—Letters—Frequent Preaching before the Queen — Extracts from Lady Lyttelton's Letters describing the Impression which he made at Court—Appointment of Mr. H. W. Wilberforce to Vicarage of East Farleigh—Correspondence with Dr. Hook on National Education and Church Establishment — Letters to Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce on Church Discipline and the Character of Tractarian Teaching—Letter of Reproof to a Friend——Vote at Oxford on the Election of the Vice-Chancellor—Appointed Sub-Almoner to the Queen—Engagements when in London—Attendance at the Meeting of the British Association at York—Publication of 'History of the American Church'—Letter from Mr. Gladstone respecting it—Incidents of a Journey to Osborne on a sudden summons to preach before the Queen . 169

CHAPTER VII.

(October 1844—October 1845.)

LAST DAYS AT ALVERSTOKE. DEANERY OF WESTMINSTER.

Mr. W. G. Ward's 'Ideal of a Christian Church' condemned—Archdeacon S. Wilberforce's course in the matter—The proposed 'New Test'—Correspondence with Mr. Gladstone respecting it—Mesmerism—Letter to Rev. R. Walker on Oxford Matters—Appointment to Deanery of Westminster—Letters—Maynooth Grant, and Sir R. Peel—Meeting of British Association at Cambridge—London Life—Progress in Worcestershire—Correspond-

PAGE

ence on Irish Church with Mr. Gladstone—Accused of Avarice by the 'Morning Post'—Extracts from Diary respecting his Incumbency of Alverstoke—Offer of Bishopric of Oxford—Extracts from Letters and Diaries concerning it—Prince Albert on 'the Functions of an English Bishop'—Account of his Work as Archdeacon of Surrey—Letter of Advice to Rev. H. W. Wilberforce on taking possession of his Living at East Farleigh—Letters to a Lady desirous of founding a Sisterhood at Alverstoke—Letter to Earl of Chichester on Mr. Drummond's Schism in Scotland 244

CHAPTER VIII.

(Oct. 19—Dec. 31, 1845.)

APPOINTMENT TO THE BISHOPRIC OF OXFORD.

State of the Church and of Public Feeling at the Time—The Oxford Movement—The Maynooth Bill—Correspondence with Dr. Pusey on his Appointment—Letters to Friends on his Appointment—Consecration—Extracts from Diary—First Ordination—Illness—Extracts from Diary—Correspondence with Mr. Gladstone on 'Newman's Theory of Development'—Letter from the Bishop of Ely upon Bishop Wilberforce's Ordinations 297

CHAPTER IX.

(1846.)

FIRST YEAR OF EPISCOPATE.

Re-arrangement of Diocese of Oxford—Rapidity with which Bishop Wilberforce made himself acquainted with his Diocese—His Ideal of a Bishop's Work—Effect of his Episcopate upon the Diocese—His Pecuniary Liberality—An Appeal to his 'Charity'—Takes his Seat in House of Lords—Letters—Secession to Rome of his Brother-in-law, Rev. H. D. Ryder—Speeches in House of Lords during his first Session of Parliament:—(1) On Religious Opinions Bill—(2) On Bishoprics of St. Asaph and Bangor—(3) On the Corn Laws—(4) On the Sugar Bill—Letters—Enlargement of Cuddesdon Palace—Consecration of Palace Chapel—Letter on a Question of Sunday Observance—The Education Question—Diocesan Patronage 340

CHAPTER X.

(1847.)

SECOND YEAR OF EPISCOPATE.

PAGE

Lord John Russell in Power—Prospect of an Increase of the Episcopate—The Welsh Bishoprics and See of Manchester—Formation of Diocesan Society for building Churches and Parsonages—Government Education Scheme—The Bishop's Speech on the Ten Hours' Factory Bill—Gratitude of Factory Operatives—His Confirmations—Letters—The Oxford Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science—Installation of Prince Albert as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge—Letters from Belvoir Castle and from Cambridge—His Mother's Death—Letters—Mode of dealing with Diocesan Affairs—Death of Archbishop Harcourt 383

CHAPTER XI.

(Nov. 1847 Jan. 1848.)

THE HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY.

Excitement caused by Nomination of Dr. Hampden to Bishopric of Hereford—Characteristics of his 'Bampton Lectures'—'His Observations on Religions Dissent'—Review of Proceedings in Oxford in 1836 and 1842—Remonstrance of the Thirteen Bishops—Lord John Russell's Reply—Addresses for and against Dr. Hampden—Bishop of Oxford's Letter to Lord John Russell, and Lord John's Reply—Bishop of Oxford's connection with the Case through the Church Discipline Act of 1840—The Bishop grants 'Letters of Request'—Attempts to obtain satisfactory Answers from Dr. Hampden on certain Points—Correspondence with Lord John Russell—Dr. Hampden's Reply—Remarks on the Bishop of Oxford's Letter to Dr. Hampden—Dr. Hampden's Note to Provost Hawkins made known to the Bishop—Withdrawal of the Letters of Request—Correspondence between the Bishop of Oxford and the Provost of Oriel—Bishop of Oxford's Letter of Dec. 28, 1847, to Dr. Hampden—Bishop of Exeter's Letter of Jan. 1, 1848, to Bishop of Oxford, with the Bishop of Oxford's Reply—Letters from Bishop of Oxford to Archdeacon Wilberforce, to Miss L. Noel, to Professor Walker, and to Rev. E. Bickersteth—Letter from Sir R. Peel—Subsequent Proceedings in the Case—General Review—Letters to Miss L. Noel 419

LIST OF PLATES TO VOL. I.

PORTRAIT AS DEAN OF WESTMINSTER . . . *Frontispiece*

CHECKENDON CHURCH . . . . . *To face page* 42

BRIGHSTONE CHURCH . . . . . „ 51

Errata.

Page 177, line 11, *for* Basil Orme Wilberforce *read* Albert Basil Orme

„ 167, last line but one, *for* 1675 *read* 1755.

INTRODUCTION.

THE FIRST REQUISITE of a Biography is Truth; that it should present a full statement of all that is necessary for the just appreciation of the character of its subject and of the events of his life; that it should avoid everything either expressed or implied which may mar that just appreciation; and that it should observe a true proportion in the prominence given to each trait in his character and each fact in his career.

It is obvious, therefore, that in exact proportion as the character is many-sided and the life eventful, truth in biography becomes more difficult of attainment. Even where the life has been uniform and with few points of contact with external events, the maintenance of due proportion in depicting a varied character requires not a little tact and judgment. On the other hand, where the character itself is simple, while the life was spent in the conduct of a multiplicity of affairs, then the combination of accuracy and completeness of detail with a true presentment of the relative bearing and importance of actions and events has difficulties of its own. It is when both these conditions are combined that the work of a biographer becomes especially arduous. He must not only show what the man was, and how he came to be so, but he must give a complete picture of what the man did and how he came to

do it; how character influenced action, and how action re-acted upon character; what he appeared to the world which saw only the outside; what he was in himself, in his aims, in his motives, and in the deeper life within. In a perfect biography, if such a work were ever written, all these several threads would be so interwoven that none should be ever entirely out of sight, while each would be continuously contributing to the completeness of the whole.

In the case of Bishop Wilberforce it is possible that the difficulty of constructing a biography which shall be true in the full sense of the word reaches its maximum. Of a temperament peculiarly mobile and sympathetic, his nature answered to every touch from without as instantaneously as the æolian harp answers to each breath of air. Each character with which he came in contact drew forth its own response, so that there were almost as many estimates formed of him as there were persons with whom he had to do. Intensely affectionate, and with a passionate craving for the sympathy which he gave so readily, he was capable also of the sternest severity and of a tenacity of purpose which no desire for the approbation even of his dearest friends could divert for a moment. Singularly honest in his own purposes, he was not unfrequently mistaken in placing confidence in others, although usually a keen judge of character; and he was capable of the most vehement indignation when face to face with meanness or duplicity.

Similar traits marked his intellectual character. Great power of concentration was combined with an incessant readiness to turn aside to fasten upon any

new object which came before him. He took an interest in everything. His observation was sleepless, and made him an excellent naturalist. If you were driving with him across a country that was new to him, the conversation would be again and again interrupted by some remark upon its geology or its vegetation. His inquisitiveness of mind was extreme, and habit had developed the natural faculty of extracting from every one whom he met whatever special information could be derived from him. In his earlier days he may have been somewhat over-bold in action, but from the first he was cautious in counsel, and his balance of judgment would have made him an admirable casuist. Though by no means what would be called a student, he was a keen and varied reader, extremely rapid and retentive, and the present writer well remembers how, while waiting for him in his library, at Cuddesdon, now nearly twenty years ago, he found a pile of the newest sceptical books and reviews upon his table, with each salient passage in their arguments underlined and commented on in the margin. And thus he was always *ready*. If unexpectedly called upon to preach, though as a rule he wrote his sermons,[1] a few minutes of extremely concentrated attention sufficed for the arrangement of his thoughts and the preparation of his matter: the words seemed to follow as a matter of course. If he arrived late at a public meeting, a short account from a friend of what had been already said by previous speakers was enough to supply him with the

[1] His Diaries teem with such entries as this :—'Up early and wrote Sermon. When in church *saw* it would be unsuitable, so changed subject and preached extempore.'

point of departure for his most effective addresses. On one occasion, at Cuddesdon, when the clergyman who had undertaken to conduct a Retreat was suddenly prevented from attending, the Bishop at the last moment volunteered to supply his place, and no one would have detected that he had not had ample time for preparation. It was thus that intellectually, as well as in the region of the feelings and affections, Bishop Wilberforce literally 'turned every way,' and found some point of contact with almost every one; so that the very richness of his mind and character led in some cases to a suspicion of unreality. The majority of men fail to realise whatever lies beyond their own horizon of character and experience, and, lacking the divine gift of sympathetic imagination, they have no other standard by which to estimate their fellows than their own knowledge of themselves. Thus all men of wide natures encounter inevitable misconception; and the writer has often been amused with looks of unwelcome surprise on the faces of men with whom the Bishop had been in close conversation on matters within their own range and ken, when they saw him instantly absorbed with equal completeness in discussing infinitely wider topics with the next person to whom he spoke.

Turning next to his active and public life, its full narration is encumbered by a like multifariousness of character and detail. As everything interested Bishop Wilberforce, so he could not help bearing a hand in whatever interested him; and the circumstances in which he was placed brought him into contact with public business and public movements of every kind. He was not only a Bishop with deepest sense of the

responsibilities of his calling, but he had all the instincts and the powers of a statesman, and his position in the House of Lords called these powers and instincts into action. The atmosphere of public business was congenial to him, and the instant that he passed into it his nature responded to it. No sooner did he take his seat in the House than there is an eager tone about his letters which tells of powers anticipating their full exercise. 'You know how all such *real business* interests me,' is an expression which occurs in an account of one of the earliest debates which he attended after he became a Peer of Parliament.[2] Thus his public life falls at once into two divisions, the parliamentary and the ecclesiastical. But even on the ecclesiastical side there is a difficulty about giving any one view of what he was and did, which calls to mind the complaint of the man who 'could not see the wood for the trees.' Bishop Wilberforce was indeed the most energetic of diocesan Bishops; and had his ecclesiastical career been limited to his diocesan administration, the real greatness and largeness of mind and character which it called forth would have demanded a biographer's full powers for its due exhibition; but this was far from being so. His lot was cast in a period of intense activity and expansion in the Church's work both at home and in the Colonies; and it was not in his nature to escape being drawn in to take an active part in almost every movement of his time. His life was not merely *connected with*, but it actually *involves*, the history of the English, and in

[2] During the period of his Brighstone Incumbency no visit to London passed without his frequently attending the Debates in Parliament.

great measure of the Colonial, Church during his Episcopate. His Colonial Church correspondence was enormous; and, to mention only two examples, it may be stated that the letters he received on the subjects of the troubles in the Church of South Africa and in Honolulu can only be counted by hundreds. Almost everywhere his advice was sought, and to every one he gave it freely. Almost everywhere his co-operation was desired, and he was ready to aid and work for all. And as if this was not enough to absorb his restless energies, Bishop Wilberforce was also the most genial of companions and of social powers almost if not altogether unrivalled. Few have ever surpassed him in keen sense of humour, in readiness of repartee, or in all that makes what the French call a *raconteur*, but for which no adequate word can be found in English. Add to which that the sparkling wit and marvellous *abandon* of humorous narration which distinguished him were aided by a voice of wonderful richness and flexibility, and an unrivalled power of manner, so that it too often happens that the fairest examples of these traits are too delicate to bear transplanting into the chilling air of a printed page.

Here, however, as in so many ways, unfriendly criticism waited on his footsteps; but in more than one instance his diaries show how closely he watched himself, and how deliberately he accepted his position as a social favourite as a means of winning influence for good over those whom otherwise he might never meet, and with whom he might never otherwise come to close quarters in personal intercourse. Bishop Wilberforce was one of the few men who could pass easily and

naturally from the lightest topics to the gravest and most earnest conversation; and he continually turned the former to account in paving the way for the latter. The numbers of letters addressed to him by persons who by this means had come to know him and to trust him, and who consulted him freely in consequence, which were found among his papers after his death, prove that in a very large number of cases the Bishop's view was justified by the event. Could anything like a collection of such letters have been made, there can be no doubt that Bishop Wilberforce would be known as the writer of 'Spiritual Letters' in addition to having been called the 'Bishop of Society.'

Of the purely domestic life it is singular how few details can now be recovered. Largely, of course, this is due to the fact that by his wife's death, so far back as March 1841, the home-life was shattered. Probably, too, it is owing to this, that even of the home-life at Brighstone from 1830 to 1840, no records remain. Scarcely a letter from himself to his wife, and only one or two from her to him, and those of only the very slightest interest, have been preserved: while the number of those early friends who can personally remember the far-off period of his married life is now of course reduced to a minimum, and their recollections, if vivid as impressions, are practically barren as to details.

This is the more unfortunate, as at a single stroke it renders this biography almost a blank upon one whole side, and that a large one, of the Bishop's character. Naturally fitted as he was to shine in public life, and delighting in the exercise of powers

which found their scope in the open field of the world's work and strife, his domestic and personal affections were of fully equal intensity, and what is quite as much to the point, were at least cultivated as much as his public capacities, so that there can be no doubt that we are all of us the poorer for the loss of a fitting picture of the home-life of Brighstone Rectory while Samuel Wilberforce was there. His was no case of a light which could shine abroad, but which was dimmed in the narrower sphere of home. Rather, so far as all indications go, the softer lights must have been in his case, if not the most brilliant, certainly the most beautiful and the most pure. Something, it is true, of all this may be inferred from the tone and tenderness of the letters to his wife's early friend, Miss Louisa Noel, which happily have been preserved, and which will be found at intervals through the first volume of this biography. Something also is revealed in fragmentary entries in his diaries as his sons grew up, and either were at home with him during the weeks which each autumn he annually spent at Lavington, or had occasion to write to him when absent. Surely it tells something of the *nature* of the writer when in the midst of notices of matters of grave import we read of one son, 'Poor —— lost his tame fox;' and the next day '——'s fox came back through hunger;' and again, with reference to another son, 'Off after early breakfast; my heart cheered, and my eyes running over with tears at a dear letter from ——. *Light all day from this letter.*' And the pleasure he took in helping one of his boys to plant the ferns he brought home from the woods is duly recorded; while the first swallows of

the year, the first nightingale, the first cuckoo, are almost always commemorated.

It is of course well known, that the Bishop was an ardent lover of natural history, but it may not always be remembered that his first and his last contributions to the 'Quarterly Review,' were reviews of his friend Mr. Knox's[3] 'Ornithological Rambles in Sussex,' and of his 'Autumns on the Spey.' Traces of the Bishop's love of birds occur in some of the earliest of the letters printed in this volume. It is touching to notice that the very latest labour of his pen was given to the subject which had interested him as a boy. The article on Darwin's 'Origin of Species' in the 'Quarterly Review' of 1860 was also his.

The Bishop's astonishing power of work should be also touched upon; and not only his power of work,

[3] The Bishop's correspondence with Mr. Knox on their common subject was really extensive, and the following letter, written during the interruption of a round of visits in Scotland and the North of England is an example of it :—

'Drumlanrig Castle, Oct. 1, 1850.

'My dear Mr. Knox,—Many thanks for your kind note, and offer of sending me the trustworthy list. I should be glad to receive it at the Right Hon. E. Ellice's, M.P., Glen Daroich, Invergarry. But in these days of Irish depression I must ask you to order it on *my* account at Van Voorst's and not tax your's to send it.

'I have sent to-day by post to Bartlett a nice specimen of the Dipper (Cinclus aquaticus?) shot for me yesterday. It abounds in these mountain streams; and here, as elsewhere, the people believe that it *runs* along the bottom of the water. It is held to be a great consumer of spawn.

'I rode yesterday to see an eyrie of peregrines in a fine wild valley, but did not get a sight of the birds.

'At present I have been chiefly struck with the absence of birds. Thrushes and tomtits abound, but I have seen few other birds. All the body of the Hirundines went just before this showery weather set in, ten days ago. A few (*I* have seen but one) martins linger on. The keeper (a very superior man to his class, and a great *preserver* of all wild birds) assures me that three or four couple are hawking about and feeding the nestlings in *one* nest, as if to see if they could be got out in time.

'With very kind remembrances to Lady Jane, believe me to remain very truly your's, S. OXON.'

but also of what, though analogous, is yet not quite the same thing, his power of 'taking trouble.' Sir Arthur Helps has somewhere said, that genius itself may be said to consist in an infinite capacity of taking trouble, or words to that effect. Allowing for the touch of paradox which must affect all such sayings, there is this kernel of real truth in the remark of which Bishop Wilberforce afforded a striking example: namely, that as true genius presupposes a special intensity of vitality in this or that direction, so such intensity of vitality will evidence itself in a capacity for bearing the galling fret and worry of 'trouble-taking,' which would utterly destroy the balance of a less robustly constituted organisation. Bishop Wilberforce could go on working at the top of his power hour after hour through the day and the night, and think no wearying trouble about details a hindrance to be put aside. Again and again throughout his diaries he appears as attending business meetings in London during the whole morning, then by railway to some church-opening, or school-opening, or stone-laying in his diocese, then by railway to some dinner-party perhaps in Staffordshire, or Gloucestershire, where he would meet some one he desired to see, then at midnight go to his room and write replies to his day's letters, until 2 A.M.;—and then, at that hour, dash off to some private friend an account of the evening's incidents and conversation, and, as often as not, add a postscript to the epistle in the carriage which next morning conveyed him to an 8 A.M. train for his return to London work and business. It is surely superfluous to ask how many men, however willing, *could*, at midnight, after such a

day's harass and excitement and fatigue, sit down calmly to letter-writing and thought. Add to which that Bishop Wilberforce was an early riser. For years together his day's diary begins, 'Up to early church,' and if through weariness the 'early church' is missed, the omission is recorded. While as to his power of taking trouble and of attention to details, every one who had to do with the Diocese of Oxford knows some instance of the extraordinary patience with which he would go into the case of any parochial trouble which required adjustment. But what few know is, that the instances with which they are acquainted were only specimens of what he was doing incessantly, and this concurrently with the giving of his full attention to the larger questions which came before him in his general guidance of the Church and in the discharge of his parliamentary duties. Of the pertinacity with which he worked out any subject for himself, a good illustration is offered by the case of Mr. Allies, which comes under notice in the second volume. There was found among the Bishop's papers, in his handwriting, an elaborate analysis of Mr. Allies' book,[1] together with all the passages which the Bishop regarded as objectionable written out in full, and classified under the heads of the several Articles of the Thirty-nine which the Bishop considered them to impugn. The time and trouble which this must have cost could not but have been very great, and it is to be noted that it was done in the early part of the year, with all

[1] *Journal in France in* 1845 *and* 1848, *with Letters from Italy in* 1847, *concerning the Church and Education.* By T. W. Allies, Rector of Launton. Longmans, 1849.

the pressure of Confirmation work full upon him, and concurrently with the business of the London season, and his attendance on Parliament.

Perhaps no man ever possessed a more remarkable power of working at all times, and of using up the interstices and odds and ends of time—a faculty which of itself indicates a more than common vital force. His habit of writing in railway-carriages is well known : but it is less known that even over bad roads, and in shaky country chaises, he would still pursue his correspondence : while his diary is full of the repeated entries of 'up at five,' or 'up at six and wrote sermon,' and this again and again, on days when he had to preach twice at churches far apart, and when the day following this early morning work was one of continued and unbroken effort. Thus once more, as an example of his method of using the spare hours of his days, more than one of his Charges, which were delivered towards the end of the year, was largely written during the intervals of travelling arising from having to wait for conveyances and the like. For instance, in the diary for 1857, when he was making a round of visits, and a tour in the North and in the Lake district, such entries as 'Had to wait at hotel for coach, so worked at Charge,' are of frequent recurrence, while on July 17 of the same year, ascending Snowdon with a large party, and having to wait long for the mist to clear away, his entry is, 'Wrote the Preface to "Bishop Armstrong's Life" in the little hut at the top, and some letters.'

The Bishop was passionately fond of North Wales, and frequently spent some time there in the autumn, taking the opportunity to speak and preach for the

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.[5] The details of his return journey from one of these Welsh visits are too characteristic to be omitted. He had preached on the Sunday, and on the Monday morning, leaving his hosts at Coed Coch near Conway, he travelled *viâ* Chester and Shrewsbury to Plâs Machynlleth, the residence of Earl Vane, now the Marquis of Londonderry. He arrived at 4 P.M. Saddle-horses were awaiting him, and with the friend who accompanied him, he scoured the country—hill and valley—until 8 P.M., barely allowing himself ten minutes to dress for dinner, and this after a railway journey of full a hundred and eighty miles. The next day he was driven to a spot well known to Welsh tourists, Minfford, at the base of Cader Idris, which he ascended and descended on foot, a serious climb for a man already nearly sixty. On Wednesday morning he attended, and spoke at, a meeting for the Propagation Society at Aberystwith, then walked some miles to a neighbouring house to luncheon, then travelled ninety miles by rail and ten more by road to Llangedwyn, the residence of Sir Watkin Williams-Wynn, arriving

[5] The Bishop became well known and very popular in North Wales through these frequent visits, and a droll incident occurred during one of them. He was staying with his old friend Bishop Short, when the Vicar of Rhyl, at that time engaged in the arduous undertaking of building a new church at the cost of 15,000*l.*, persuaded him to preach within its partially finished walls in aid of its completion. The sermon was announced for a week day, and the day chosen chanced to be one on which the redoubtable Tom Sayers had fixed for an exhibition of wild beasts in the same town, whose posting-bills already covered every available space of its walls, and the question arose which attraction would prevail? It was not long doubtful, for as soon as Sayers heard that the Bishop was going to preach he beat a retreat, and, in spite of his notices, he abandoned Rhyl and took his menagerie to Abergele.

It is added that it was only at the Bishop's earnest desire that a cartoon was not prepared for 'Punch,' representing Tom Sayers and his beasts retreating in confusion before the Bishops of Oxford and St. Asaph!

at 8.45 : dinner at 9 and bed at 12.45. On the Thursday morning, after a 6-o'clock breakfast, he was off before 7, reached Crewe between 8 and 9, and London at 1.30. There he had a multitude of appointments, occupying the time until 4.30, after which he left town for Salisbury, where by 8 he was ready to join a large party at the Bishop's, and then, after dinner, he entertained the whole company in the drawing-room by a reading of 'Enoch Arden,' then just published. The traffic-manager had given him a carriage to himself, so that during the journey to Salisbury he had both written his day's letters and dressed for dinner.

One aspect only of Bishop Wilberforce's life and character has thus far not been so much as referred to in this Introduction, and yet it is one which, as will appear abundantly in the sequel, was quite as largely developed as those which met the world's eye, and which, however well known to his more intimate friends, will probably surprise some even of them by its depth and fervour :—*i.e.* his devotional character. Upon this, however, it is scarcely seemly for a biographer to dwell further than to state that the striking illustrations of it furnished from his diaries and letters are but the few specimens, which best admit of publication, of what in fact pervades them all from the days of his early tour with his friend C. Anderson in Switzerland [6] to the end of his life.[7] The amount of reserve which

[6] See vol. i. p. 39.

[7] The writer adds a personal recollection. The Bishop was speaking to him and one or two others, at Cuddesdon, of the value to the clergy of the Daily Services of the Church, as used privately, if not said publicly. Some one replied, 'Yes, but with our varied occupations the Evening Service is not so easy, until late at night, when it is hardly appropriate.' The Bishop's reply was immediate :

has in fact been observed is in all probability what he himself would have approved. The original edition of his father's Life contained long and numerous extracts of this character from his diaries. When, in his older years, the Bishop was preparing the abridged edition, his companion observed him to be striking out a large proportion of them, and the Bishop explained that he did it because their publication appeared to his maturer judgment to lay bare too much of the inner sanctuary of a man's spiritual life.

With all this in view it is obvious that the most picturesque, the most vivid, the most striking method of exhibiting such a character would have been to select a few salient features of his work and of his life as seen in each of the different aspects which have been indicated. It would not have been difficult—indeed it would have been much the easiest way—to depict him as Bishop first of Oxford and then of Winchester, and to show what he took in hand and what he accomplished in his successive dioceses; then to select a few of the more remarkable instances in which he influenced the course of the Church History of his time, such as the way in which he converted the High Church movement from being a mere school of opinion, as its tendency was when he came to his see, to become the most powerful of active agents in practical duty, and still more his successful efforts for the revival of Convocation, when the Earl of Aberdeen was Prime Minister, and his unresting watchfulness over its movements until the time of his death; then

'Four o'clock, when possible, is my time for it, and I find a cab an excellent place to say it in.'

to trace his relations to the Colonial Church, illustrating it mainly by his active support of Bishop Gray of Capetown; then to exhibit his Parliamentary career, not unchecked at its outset by opposition, but ending in his becoming a recognised power in the House of Lords—besides giving such a picture of the Man and of the Christian as would bind in one the several presentments of his character.

Tempting, however, as was this easier path, it was necessary to reject it, partly as lacking the element of biographical completeness; but still more because in Bishop Wilberforce's case, more than almost any other man's, it would have come short in what has been already spoken of as the first requisite of biography, namely, truth. Nothing short of an attempt (at least) to give a *complete* biography could convey any adequate impression of the extraordinary multifariousness of his occupations and his interests, of the multitude of matters ever simultaneously engaging his attention, and of the persons with whom he had to do.

It seemed right, it seemed due to the Bishop's memory, it seemed due to the readers, large numbers of whom must be personally acquainted with much of the Bishop's career, to make the really far more arduous attempt to set forth the Bishop's whole life and career—so far as it *can* be represented—as it actually took place, in unbroken chronological order, leaving each individual aspect of it, and of himself, to reveal itself in the course of the narrative, and trusting that by the absolute fulness and unreserve with which the work is done, no essential feature may be left undeveloped. Of course there is the danger, above referred

to, of obscuring the central personality by the crowd of details. But it is the peculiarity of Bishop Wilberforce's career to present this difficulty to a biographer throughout his whole life; from the time when he was rector of a country parish in the Isle of Wight, to the last days of his episcopate as Bishop of Winchester. His own unceasing energies created the infinite activities which tend to hide him from our view, just as some fertilising river nourishes the trees which overshadow its waters.

One advantage at least the present biographer has enjoyed. During by far the larger part of his life the Bishop's diaries were kept with rigid punctuality, while during considerable periods his own letters will serve the double purpose of relating the actual facts and of revealing his motives, his feelings, and his intentions. One only remark appears to be needed as to the selection which in some cases has been made from the letters placed at the biographer's disposal. Among those actually printed there will be some in which the opinions expressed regarding men and things will be unexpected; others which manifest a vehemence of feeling which may excite surprise. In all these cases one rule has been followed. Such letters have only been printed where they are examples of many others in which the same, or almost the same, expressions recur. In all cases where a letter thus dealing with any public question, or public man, whether lay or clerical, has stood alone, or where it obviously represented only a temporary phase of feeling or transitory impression, such letter has not been printed. The fact is, that Bishop Wilberforce *was* outspoken even to

vehemence. Trained to habitual self-control, there may have been many of those who saw him frequently who were yet strangers to his more impetuous mood. But the mood was there, and the picture of him would be most untrue and incomplete if the occasional outbursts of robust denunciation had been timidly suppressed.[8]

[8] That some people ascribed an irascibility to him which was without the slightest foundation in fact is shown by the following story, one which the Bishop frequently related with keen enjoyment.

Early in his episcopate he was travelling from Paddington to Oxford in one of the double first-class compartments of the Great Western Railway. His compartment was occupied by himself alone: the other by two gentlemen, both strangers to him. The Bishop was, according to his custom, writing letters, his hat in the netting, his head covered with a most unepiscopal skullcap, so that no one unacquainted with his features would suspect him being a Bishop. Ere long, with that quickness of hearing, with which all who knew him intimately were familiar, he caught his own name as being the subject of discussion in the adjoining compartment:—'Wonderful man, the Bishop of Oxford,' said one speaker. 'Yes,' said the other, 'but what a terrible stumbling-block, that temper of his!' 'Temper,' was the response, 'I never heard of it. Pray explain.' 'Why,' replied the former, 'there is an awful kind of Berserk fury which seizes him at times; and, in his house at Cuddesdon, there are recesses made in the passages and in the walls of the staircase, so that if any of his children or of the servants meet him when the fit is on, they may take refuge in time to avoid him.'

Upon this the Bishop, leaning forward and speaking through the open window between the compartments, said, 'Gentlemen, I have accidentally overheard your conversation. Now I spend more time, probably, with the Bishop of Oxford in his own house than any other living man; and perhaps know more of his faults, of which no doubt there are many. But I think I am bound to tell you that this description of temper is not one of them. If it had been, I *must* have known it.'

The gentlemen bowed, and thanked him. Nevertheless, as he sat back again, the Bishop overheard the first speaker whisper to the other, 'Just so. That is the way all his friends talk. Nevertheless, it is perfectly true!'

But as an example how inventions gather round any conspicuous public character, the writer may add the following personal recollection.

Years after the date of the above, when the storm against the Bishop's High-churchmanship was at its height, during the attacks upon the newly-founded College at Cuddesdon, the Bishop was being discussed at a dinner-party not a dozen miles from Cuddesdon, and as usual met with warm defenders as well as accusers. 'Whatever his lieutenants may be,' said one, 'the Bishop himself is perfectly free from all extravagances.' 'Perhaps he *is*,' replied another with a sly emphasis on the word *is*: 'perhaps he *is*, for he has grown wiser now. But *I* can tell you, that when he first came to the See, and had finished his Chapel, he

Neither has there been any doubt as to the divisions of the work. It became evident, so soon as the materials for the Life had been surveyed, that the Bishop's public life divided itself into three well-marked stages of different character and complexion. It was in reality a drama in three acts. These were—first, the period ending with the Hampden Controversy of the close of 1847 and the opening of 1848. Next, the period from thence to the year 1860. Lastly, the period from 1860 to the time of the accident which closed his life in July 1873.

Throughout the first of these Bishop Wilberforce is seen—if the phrase may be permitted—in the making. At the close of it he was little more than forty-two years of age, and the real work of his career was yet to be begun. All these years, save only 1841, when occurred the great sorrow of his life, his wife's death, were years of sunshine and of brightness, of cheerful happy work, which failure had not tarnished nor opposition embittered. They were years of growing powers, of ripening character, of striking popularity, and of rapid advancement. At five-and-twenty he was Rector

used to go in procession from the Library to the Chapel with an acolyte before him swinging a censer!'

The speaker was a grave Rural Dean in the diocese, well beneficed, the Prebendary of a Cathedral, and the brother of a judge.

A propos of his practice of writing letters in railway-carriages mentioned in the former story, it may be told that, having dated a letter, so writte , 'Rail, near Reading,' the receiver, ignorant alike of his identity, and of his habit, directed the reply as follows :—

S. Oxon, Esq.,
Rail,
Near Reading.

Nevertheless the letter was delivered within a post or two at the Bishop's London address in Eaton Place. The envelope was preserved for many years as an example of the perception of the officials of the Post-Office.

of Brighstone; at thirty-one, Rural Dean; at thirty-six, Archdeacon of Surrey; shortly afterwards Rector of Alverstoke and Canon of Winchester; then Chaplain to Prince Albert and at once in high favour at Court; then for a short time Dean of Westminster; and, while yet only just forty, Bishop of Oxford. With all this he was as far as possible from being the mere favourite of fortune. Promotion, which does not always follow energetic service, in him had been bestowed on one who in each successive sphere had worked as few men could. And energetic service, which so often only rouses opposition, in his case, and especially at Alverstoke, had met with uniform appreciation. He had also achieved the highest success as a public speaker; he had long been eagerly listened to in the University pulpit at Oxford; while of the impression made by his preaching, both at Court and at Westminster, the diary of Lord Carlisle and the letters of Lady Lyttelton, quoted in the sequel, are contemporary testimony. The first two years of his episcopate are also included in this period, and through them also is prolonged the brightness of his earlier time. In his first appearances in Parliament he stepped at once into the front rank both as a speaker and as a debater; and his first essays in diocesan administration were happy and successful.

Then with the commencement of the third year of his episcopate, upon a sudden all this was changed; and what is to the point in reference to the arrangement of this biography, the change affected his whole subsequent career. It marks the close of the first, the opening of a second, act in the drama of his life.

He had been exactly two years a bishop when, in the storm which arose about the matter of Doctor Hampden, it seemed as if all the winds of hostility and misunderstanding which had been held back from touching him in his previous course were now let loose to burst upon him with accumulated force. The matter is gone into at great length at the close of this first volume. It is touched on here only so far as it constitutes a turning-point in Bishop Wilberforce's life. From the epoch of that unhappy controversy Bishop Wilberforce entered on a career of struggle. His Court favour was gone: gradually, too, opposition gathered round him as one who favoured the unpopular school of the Oxford theology; and the very energy with which he discharged his diocesan duties called forth a resistance alike from those who were jealous of his brilliancy, from those who disliked his activity, and from those who disapproved his opinions, which it took him years to meet and overcome. It is now more than half a generation since the diocese of Oxford began to be pointed to as an example of a diocese in which peace and harmony were to be found, not as the concomitants of sloth and indifference, but in combination with vigorous spiritual life and activity. It was not so thirty years ago, when large and influential sections of the diocese banded themselves together to resist Bishop Wilberforce's measures and Bishop Wilberforce's influence. Not long after the year 1848 the tempest of hostility which had raged against the comparatively small section of the Tractarian School began to change into an opposition to all who held with what may be termed High Church views in

general. There were several causes which led to this. There was the 'Papal Aggression' of 1851. There was the Gorham controversy on the doctrine of Baptism. There was also the rising question of the revival of Convocation, disliked by the Low-Church party, extremely unpopular at Court, and misunderstood throughout the country; a cause which the Bishop of Oxford espoused with all his energy, and thereby separated himself from many of his old friends, notably from Archbishop J. B. Sumner and from the Bishop of Winchester. Thus, though he never was a 'Tractarian,' yet as being distinctively a Churchman, and therefore aggrieved by the Gorham decision, which drove not a few to Rome, next as being the champion of Church action through the revival of Convocation, and perhaps also not a little through jealousy of his vigorous supervision of his diocese in his office of Bishop, no small part of the old outcry against the leaders of the Tractarian movement came to be diverted upon him. This, too, was the period during which, his brother-in-law Archdeacon Manning, as also his brothers, Henry and Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce, seceded to Rome; the latter so severe a blow that for a short space the Bishop deliberately contemplated the resignation of his See. Thus then Bishop Wilberforce was opposed as the High-Church Bishop. The Church Missionary Society, for which in years past he had shown such sympathy, treated his wishes, in matters concerning his diocese, with small consideration. The early years of his College for Clergy at Cuddesdon were beset with suspicions, which gave rise to a war of pamphlets of more than common

acrimony, and in some cases of considerable ability. In short, the whole period from 1848 to 1860 was one during which his energies and his skill were largely taxed to overcome a diocesan opposition of a most stubborn and tenacious character; such, it should be added, as in the first days of his episcopate could hardly have been anticipated. But the very opposition which he encountered, and the vigour with which he breasted the obloquy which fell upon him through his advocacy of a revived Convocation, when taken together with the vigorous diocesan work which he carried out, had at least this result,—that they taught Churchmen where to look for a leader whose grasp of first principles was firm, and who not only had the courage of his convictions, but the capacity to give them effect. By the end of 1860 Bishop Wilberforce was undisputed master of his diocese; of his chief opponents some had been conciliated, others removed by time or circumstances, while others withdrew from further strife; and so the second act in the drama closed under very different circumstances from those with which it opened.

Of the third period—that, namely, from 1860 to the end in 1873—it must suffice to say that with 1860 Bishop Wilberforce stood out, not only as undisputed leader among the English Bishops,—this he had manifestly been since the retirement of Bishop Blomfield in 1856,—but also as undisputed master of his diocese, and as something more than either. He was no longer merely 'the Bishop of Oxford,' and foremost among his equals, but he had become the representative man of the English Episcopate, in great measure

the representative man of the English Church; and such as by that time he had become, such he remained during the rest of his life. It was now, too, that, as his letters show, his position was not Anglican only, but, to use an expression not then invented, Pan-Anglican. Bishops in the United States consulted him. Did a hard-pressed Colonial Bishop require support and counsel, it was to Bishop Wilberforce that he naturally turned; while, as to the Home Church, if he did not succeed to the Chair of St. Augustine, it may be questioned whether his practical influence would have been increased if he had. By the sad accident on the Surrey Downs on July 19, 1873, not only did Winchester and England lose a Bishop, but the Anglican Communion throughout the world had to lament her foremost man.

The considerations which have now been detailed have had another result. It soon became apparent that if the Life were to be written in a manner in any way approaching completeness, it must not only be a work of much time, but also of considerable extent. The fact that the Life thus *divided itself* into three comparatively manageable portions, each with a real and not an artificial or conventional completeness of its own, and each of which might be dealt with in a separate volume, has led to the decision to publish each volume separately as it is completed. Important in many respects as was Bishop Wilberforce's political career, still it must be chiefly as a Bishop that he will be remembered, and the two latter volumes will each have an independent interest of its own, arising, not merely from the different positions which the Bishop

occupied during their respective periods, but also from the fact that the year 1860, with which the second will terminate, ushered in a new chapter in the recent history of the Church of England. The scene upon which the reader will enter in Volume II. will not be more different from that in Volume I. than will that of Volume III. from that of Volume II. The year 1860 was a dividing line in our recent annals. It was after 1860, that in the controversy which arose upon the subject of the 'Essays and Reviews,' the hitherto comparatively unobserved growth of what are now called Broad Church opinions came prominently into view. Keen observers had foretold it as an inevitable reaction from the Tractarian movement. So long ago as 1845, Archbishop Tait, then head-master of Rugby, in a pamphlet on the proposed condemnation of Mr. W. G. Ward for transgressing in the direction of Rome, had deprecated stringent measures, and warned his friends that if they tied Mr. Ward's hands too tightly now they would find the inconvenience to themselves in the day of their own surely approaching development. The opening of the seventh decade of our century justified the forecast, and the years which followed 1860 found Bishop Wilberforce (the representative of the Anglican *via media*) opposing the now full-fledged Broad Church School as strenuously as ever he had resisted Mr. Ward and the Romanisers, with this difference, that in 1845 he was simply Archdeacon Wilberforce, discussing it in letters to his friends and recording his vote; whereas in 1860 he was speaking in the pulpit of St. Mary's with all the authority of the Bishop, and active at the Convocation

of Canterbury, which he had mainly contributed to reanimate. It was the same class of causes working in a different sphere and amid different circumstances which brought about the next great question which marked this last period of the Bishop's ecclesiastical career :— the South African troubles. There, through the theological aberrations of Bishop Colenso, the whole question of the constitutional *status* of our Colonial Churches came under review, and there was the singular spectacle of the Broad Church School straining every nerve to subjugate Colonial *Churches* to the courts at home, while striving to endow a Colonial *Bishop* with the utmost independence of theological standards. In all the discussions on the large constitutional questions which the Colenso controversy brought about, we feel ourselves in an atmosphere which would have been impossible before the year 1860. And then, thirdly, as if by way of contrast if not of counterpoise, there follows, in 1866, the commencement of the Ritualist disturbance, together with all that Bishop Wilberforce's experienced sagacity was doing —and had he lived might have succeeded in doing —to give healthy direction to unquestioned zeal. With the newer 'Ritualistic excesses' Bishop Wilberforce had no more sympathy than with the earlier 'Tractarian extremes,' and when the third volume sees the light some strong language will be found to be applied to them ; but for the spiritual vitality which he recognised as underlying them he had the profoundest sympathy, and it was no fault of his that a warmth, which might have been so handled as to diffuse a genial glow throughout the whole Church, has

been irritated into what has very nearly proved a dangerous fever. The closing volume will also have to exhibit his course with regard to an event to which, as will be seen from this first volume, he had in some degree looked forward from comparatively early days—the disestablishment of the Irish Church. But enough has now been said, not only to indicate the plan of the work, but to show how, with each successive volume, new fields are entered and new circumstances encountered, so that each will of necessity have a completeness in itself which can rarely be found in volumes forming portions of the record of the same life.

The writer desires to acknowledge most gratefully the kindness of the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., in submitting to him his large collection of the late Bishop's letters to himself, and for permitting the publication of many letters of his own to the Bishop.

To the Rev. W. F. Wilberforce, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Ousebridge, York, the writer is deeply indebted for the use of the series of letters from the Bishop to his brother, the late Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce. He desires also to express his thanks to the Hon. Sir A. H. Gordon for the invaluable series of letters to himself from the Bishop, commencing with 1853, as well as for permission to publish letters written by himself. His best thanks are due to the Bishop of Ely for his letter descriptive of the Bishop of Oxford's Ordinations, to Sir Charles

Anderson of Lea, and to the Venerable the Archdeacon Sir George Prevost, not merely for contributing letters for publication, but for their unvarying kindness in furnishing information again and again which could have been obtained from no other sources.

LIFE

OF

BISHOP WILBERFORCE.

CHAPTER I.

(1805–23.)

BOYHOOD AND SCHOOL-LIFE.

BIRTH, PARENTAGE, AND FAMILY DETAILS—SINGULAR PAINS BESTOWED BY HIS FATHER ON HIS EARLY TRAINING—TUTORS—THE INTIMACY BETWEEN MR. W. WILBERFORCE AND THE SARGENT FAMILY—SELECTIONS FROM THE LETTERS OF HIS FATHER TO SAMUEL WILBERFORCE—ADVICE RESPECTING HIS MODE OF LIFE AT THE UNIVERSITY.

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, the third son of William Wilberforce and his wife Barbara Ann, eldest daughter of Isaac Spooner, Esq., of Elmdon Hall in the county of Warwick, was born at Clapham Common, near London, on September 7, 1805. William, the eldest of his three brothers, was born in 1798, and died at the end of May, 1879. Of all the four sons William was the only one who did not enter Holy Orders, but was called to the Bar in 1825. In 1837 he was returned at the head of the poll as member of Parliament in the Conservative interest for Kingston-upon-Hull, but was unseated on petition, in 1838, on account of alleged want of qualification. In 1841 he unsuccessfully contested, first Taunton, and next Bradford; since which

time he retired into private life, and became a Roman Catholic about the year 1854. Robert Isaac, the second son, was born in 1802, and died at Albano near Rome in February 1857. He was Vicar of East Farleigh near Maidstone from 1832 to 1840, then Vicar of Burton Agnes near Hull until 1854, and Archdeacon of the East Riding from 1841 until 1854, in which year he resigned his preferments and became a Roman Catholic. Henry William, the youngest of the four sons, was born in 1807 and died in 1873. He was incumbent of Bransgore, near Ringwood, from 1834 to 1841, Vicar of Walmer from 1841 to 1843, and Vicar of East Farleigh near Maidstone from 1843 to 1850, when he resigned the living on joining the Roman Catholic Church. The daughters were Barbara, who died unmarried in 1821, and Elizabeth, who was married in 1831 to the Rev. J. James, now Rector of Avington, near Hungerford; she died in 1832, and was buried in the churchyard of Brighstone, Isle of Wight, of which place her brother Samuel was then Rector.

Of Samuel Wilberforce's lineage and ancestry it is needless here to speak, but it is somewhat singular that while it can be traced back so far as the days of Henry II., no Wilberfoss, or Wilberforce, as the name has been spelt from the time of his great-grandfather, is found to have entered Holy Orders until the time of the subject of our present Memoir and his two brothers, Robert and Henry.

Of his father it is still less needful to speak at length. His career and character have left their mark upon English life and English society, and they have been vividly set forth in the well-known Biography,[1] of

[1] Published originally in five volumes, by Mr. John Murray, Albemarle Street, in 1838; and followed, in 1840, by two volumes of his 'Correspondence.'

which the late Bishop put forth a revised and condensed edition so recently as 1868. But, though few memoirs have given a more living picture of their subject, one feature in his character must here be noticed, not indeed for the purpose of adding to the portrait, but as bearing on the early training of his distinguished son.

Of Samuel Wilberforce's earliest years few details have been preserved; but from the beginning of the year 1817, when he was in his twelfth year, the father's devotion to his son is exhibited by a series of not fewer than six hundred letters which are still extant, all carefully numbered and noted in the handwriting of Samuel Wilberforce's maturer years, and which must have exercised the most powerful influence on the formation of his character. Compare these letters with his subsequent career, and it will at once be seen that Samuel Wilberforce was indeed his father's son. Nascent faults carefully marked and checked, personal habits of upright conduct strenuously enforced, shrewd practical counsels as to social duties and conduct towards his equals constantly suggested, and all these strung upon the one thread of ever-repeated inculcation of the duty of private prayer as the one holdfast of life,—these remarkable letters exhibit the influences which formed that solid substratum of character which underlay the brilliant gifts and the striking career of Samuel Wilberforce. These letters do not appear less noteworthy when looked at from the side of the writer. William Wilberforce was by no means a young man[2] when these letters began; he was not a man of leisure; Samuel was not an only or even an eldest son that his father could concentrate on him the whole or even the major part of his solicitude. He was in the full tide of

[2] Born in August 1759, he was forty-six when his son Samuel was born, and was more than fifty-seven when the series of letters began.

London life and parliamentary occupation; he had three other sons to care for; and, besides all this, his health was weak and his eyesight failing, so that in many instances he has to mention that he was writing with closed eyes. In after years the Bishop was remarkable for his facility in banishing all thoughts of previous business, and giving himself up with complete sympathy to the affairs of those who consulted him; and we see the same thing here. It is the son and his affairs alone that occupy the father's mind. No needless word regarding his own pursuits is obtruded, no attempt is made to excite a premature interest in his own absorbing objects. Even the anti-slavery cause, the one great external purpose of his life, seems to be forgotten, and the very first occasion of its mention is in a letter dated December 28, 1832, when Samuel Wilberforce was Rector of Brighstone, and had been four years in Holy Orders.

Before entering at Oxford his education had been wholly private. In March 1817, he was a pupil in the house of the Rev. S. Langston, at Hastings; then, towards the end of the same year, he was placed for a short time with the Rev. E. G. Marsh, at Nuneham near Oxford, after which, at the beginning of 1819, he became the pupil of the Rev. George Hodson, afterwards Canon of Lichfield and Archdeacon of Stafford, but then chaplain to Mr. Lewis Way, of Stanstead Park, in Sussex, near Emsworth, and occupying a house close to the Park. Two circumstances favoured this arrangement. Mrs. Hodson was the niece of Mr. Stephen,[3] who had married Mr. Wilberforce's elder

[3] A brilliant sketch of Mr. Stephen is given in vol. i. pp. 402-405 of Lord Brougham's *Speeches*, quoted by Sir James Stephen (his son) in pp. 550-552 of his *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*. Mr. Stephen had spent much of his early life in the West Indies, and was an enthusiastic ally of Mr. William Wilberforce in his anti-slavery efforts.

sister. 'I am thankful that you like Mrs. Hodson as well as Mr. Hodson,' writes his father on February 13, 1819. 'Indeed I feel towards her as towards a near relation, on account of her near relationship to my most dear kind brother-in-law, your uncle Stephen.' Besides this, there was the old friendship between Mr. Wilberforce and Mr. Lewis Way, which naturally led them to wish their children to be associated in early life. Among Mr. Hodson's other pupils were the late James Thomason, who rose to eminence in the Indian Civil Service, the late Henry Hoare,[4] known especially in connection with the revival of Convocation, and Mr. Lewis Way's son, Albert Way. Samuel Wilberforce uniformly spent the Saturday afternoon at the Park, where, besides being welcome for his father's sake, he was personally a favourite; and as Mr. Hodson's pupils used occasionally to read the lessons in Mr. Way's domestic chapel, it was at the eagle-lectern there that the voice of Samuel Wilberforce was first heard in the service of the Church.[5] Here it may also be fitly mentioned that Lavington, with which the future Bishop's name was to be indissolubly connected, was at no great distance from Stanstead, where Mr. and Mrs. Sargent[6] were constant visitors, as well as intimate

[4] The Bishop used to say that he owed everything in life to having been in the same class with H. Hoare, who, at the end of one half-year, both carried off the prize and at the same time inflicted on him an unlimited thrashing. Upon this S. Wilberforce made a resolution that he would never again suffer Hoare to beat him in an examination, and he took to working so systematically, and formed the habit of application so thoroughly, that he was never again beaten. As to the trial of physical strength, it was never repeated, for, as the Bishop said, 'we never quarrelled again.'

[5] Bishop Wilberforce always retained a warm recollection of his father's friend, and was himself a faithful friend to Mr. Way's family. On Mr. Way's decease, in 1840, he wrote: 'I believe you know how I loved him. How could I help it? For you remember his exceeding kindness to me; the volume of affection which he was wont every Saturday afternoon to pour forth, to vivify and quicken affections and intellect.'

[6] Miss Drusilla Way writes: 'The Sargents were constantly at Stanstead.'

friends of Mr. W. Wilberforce. Mrs. Sargent, the Bishop's future mother-in-law, was the daughter of Mr. Abel Smith, the elder brother of the first Lord Carrington, and first-cousin[7] to Mr. Wilberforce. 'She was almost my daughter,' wrote Mr. Wilberforce in 1813; 'her father, my first-cousin, who lived thirteen years under my mother's roof throughout the period of my childhood, and who brought her down in his arms at three weeks old to introduce her to me: and he dying a few weeks afterwards, I always regarded her as under my special wing.' Neither was Mr. Sargent a stranger to Mr. W. Wilberforce. In the same letter he goes on to congratulate himself that he had been chiefly 'instrumental' in promoting her marriage with one whom he there describes as 'one of the very first Christians I know.' Mr. Sargent,[8] as heir to the Lavington property, had been brought up to the bar, but at Cambridge he had come under Mr. Simeon's influence, and received a strong bias towards the ministry of the Church, which resulted ere long in his being ordained and becoming rector of the parish. While Samuel Wilberforce was a pupil under Mr. Hodson, the Sargent family occupied the rectory-house of Graffham, and there it was that, being taken to visit them by Mr. Lewis Way, he was for the first

[7] The elder Mr. Abel Smith and Mr. W. Wilberforce's father had married daughters of Mr. T. Bird, of Barton, Warwickshire. Thus Mr. W. Wilberforce, the next Mr. Abel Smith, and Lord Carrington were cousins. This Mr. Abel Smith married in 1777, and dying in 1779, left an only child, Mary, who married, in 1804, the Rev. John Sargent, of Lavington, as stated above. Mr. W. Wilberforce's aunt, Judith Wilberforce, married John Bird, the brother of the two sisters Bird just named, and was the maternal grandmother of the late J. B. Sumner and R. C. Sumner, respectively Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of Winchester.

[8] Born October 8, 1780, educated at Eton, and King's College, Cambridge, entered at the Temple 1802, ordained deacon in 1805, the year following his marriage, and priest in 1806. Mr. Sargent entered on the cure of the parishes of Lavington and Graffham, not then united, immediately on his ordination, and so remained until his decease in 1833.

time the guest of his father's friends and of his own future father-in-law. Mr. Sargent was the friend and correspondent, and afterwards the biographer, of Henry Martyn, and likewise of Mr. Thomason, the Indian missionary, and a slight sketch of his life and character was prefixed by his son-in-law, Samuel Wilberforce, to the edition of Henry Martyn's 'Journals and Letters' which he published, while Rector of Brighstone, in 1837.

On Mr. Hodson's leaving Stanstead, in 1820, for a curacy at Maisemore, near Gloucester, Samuel Wilberforce accompanied him and remained there until the end of 1821. In 1822 he became the pupil of the Rev. F. Spragge, of Little Bounds, Bidborough, near Tunbridge, in Kent, where he continued until, in October 1823, he went into residence at Oriel College, Oxford. At Little Bounds Albert Way, who had been with him under Mr. Hodson, was again his fellow pupil, and as Mr. W. Wilberforce was now occupying Marden Park, a house at no great distance, near Godstone, in Surrey, he used frequently to send for the two youths to spend the Sundays with him. Mr. C. J. Hoare, the Vicar of Godstone, afterwards Archdeacon of Surrey, was an intimate friend alike of Mr. Wilberforce and of the Sargents, and was godfather to Emily Sargent, afterwards Mrs. Samuel Wilberforce. One who knew the Bishop intimately, both at Oxford and in after life, and who first met him during these days of Sunday visits to Marden Park, writes :—'My acquaintance with him began, to the best of my recollection, in the early part of the year 1823, when I came to Marden Park, in Surrey, as the friend of Robert I. Wilberforce, with whom I had already become intimate, having been more than a year with him at Oriel. My religious training had been of quite a different kind from theirs, but I remember S. Wilberforce never said anything

that could at all pain me. There was always in him the same tenderness and thoughtfulness for others, which characterised him in advanced years. The same disposition to look upon every question on both sides showed itself already in him at the age of seventeen or eighteen, and the same readiness to take the most favourable and at the same time the most practical view of the characters with whom he had to deal—a quickness, I mean, in seeing in what way they could be most readily influenced for good.'

It is evident, from the traits of character here noticed in Samuel Wilberforce at the age of little more than seventeen, that his father's careful training had been bestowed on a kindly soil. From the very first hour of Samuel's leaving home his father's letters are full of the duty of consideration for other people, and they are remarkable also for basing it at once on the highest motives. Almost the very earliest letter extant is upon this head :—

Mr. Wilberforce to Samuel Wilberforce.

London, February 10, 1817.

My dear Samuel,—Considering how very much I am engaged during the sitting of Parliament, so that where I have one minute to spend as I please, for instance, in writing to my dear Lamb, you have 30 or perhaps 60 minutes at your command—considering, I say, our relative situations in this respect, you really ought to send me 30 or 60 letters for one that you receive from me, especially when you take into account the vast number of my correspondents. Yet I will not stand on my rights with my very dear Boy. On the contrary, no sooner had your last gratifying letter reached me than I began to think how I could answer it. . . .

I hope my dear Samuel remembers what I used to say to him of its not being enough to be good negatively, that is, not to be unkind, but that he tries to be kind positively. Unless

this is his endeavour, he will never be able to secure himself against actual unkindness. And how shocking must it appear to a Holy God, and to the Holy Spirit, for any one to grieve his Saviour by being UNkind to others, who is himself continually receiving marks of such kindness from a gracious Providence. I hope you guard against wandering thoughts in prayer. Farewell, my dearest Boy. With kind rem^{ces} to dear ——, to whom I'll write soon, I remain ever y^{r} affec^{te} father,

W. WILBERFORCE.

Once more, and at the same early period :—

Kensington Gore, Thursday, March 6, 1817.

I hope my dear Lamb will, during his absence from his earthly father and mother, look up the more earnestly to that heavenly Father who watches over all that put their trust in Him, and has given special encouragement to children to apply to Him for every needful blessing. Above all, my dear Boy, strive against *formality* in your private prayers. Endeavour to *realise the presence* of your God and Saviour, and to be assured that, tho' not visible by your bodily eyes, they are really present with you. Try to bring on Henry in all good, ever remembering my advice not to be satisfied with merely not being unkind, but trying positively to *be* kind. May God bless you, my very dear Boy, and make you a blessing to many hereafter, as well as a comfort to the advancing years of your affec^{te} father,

W. WILBERFORCE.

Ten days after a somewhat similar letter ends with :—

I think my dear Sam^{l} is greatly improved in bearing little crosses of his inclinations properly, and I recollected this would reach you on a Sunday.

A little later on, another is headed, 'Read this on Sunday,' and concludes with :—

Keep this letter by you, my very dear Sam^{l}, and read it often as the advice of an affectionate father, who hopes, if

you live, that you will be an honour to his name, a comfort to your family, and a blessing to your fellow-creatures.

The following are extracts from the first letter after Samuel Wilberforce had gone to Mr. Hodson's, dated February 13, 1819 :—

I rejoice that you have so good a boy as your chum, and I trust you and he will agree together. Remember, the only way by which this agreement can be preserved will be by being always disposed to give way to the wish or will of your companion when there is nothing wrong in question. Politeness makes people give up points to others ; but a Christian will do so from a higher motive—from a desire to please his Saviour, Whom he knows to be an eyewitness of his thoughts, words, feelings, and actions, and Who he knows condescends to be gratified by the little acts of self-denial which we practise for His sake. Oh, my dear, dear Boy, how earnestly I wish and hope that God may bless you with his Holy Spirit. I shall pray for you to-morrow between 2 and 3 o'clock, and again between 8 and 9. One of the greatest benefits to be derived from being with other boys is that of learning to give up your own will and way with good-humour.

I am obliged to you for giving me an account of your daily labours. You seem to be pretty well worked. I hope my dearest Boy will never suffer his unwillingness to leave his bed to seduce him into hurrying over his prayers by not leaving him time to go through them seriously. Ever your most affectionate father,

W. WILBERFORCE.

Later on in the same year, occurs the following :—

(*Private.*)

Near Worcester, October 5, 1819.

My very dear Samuel,—Though I have now by my side a large mass of unanswered letters, which accumulated while we were travelling from place to place, yet I must not suffer any other correspondents to prevent my writing to my dearest

Sam[1], especially when I have to reply to so interesting a letter as that which I last received from you. I wish all my children so to open their hearts to me, and you may be assured that I will always keep any secrets you may trust to me, and that you may always state to me everything of every kind with the persuasion that I shall never be angry at what you may say to me if you should tell me of faults, still less shall I ever bring up again in any way that can be unpleasant anything which you may in confidence commit to me. In short, I wish my dear Lamb to communicate with me as with a friend. Never can he have a friend who will love him better, or be more interested for his happiness: never any one whose interests and credit are so closely, I may say inseparably implicated, I might term it identified, with his own.

My dear Boy asks me what are his chief faults that he may pray and watch and strive against them. This is all right; but then I must premise, that is, I must previously suggest to him, that the most effectual way in which a Christian can get the better of any particular fault is by cultivating the *Root of all Holiness*, by endeavouring to obtain a closer union with Jesus Christ, and to acquire more of that blessed Spirit, instead of *grieving* it, which will enable him to conquer all his corruptions, and to improve and strengthen all his Christian graces.

I will mention a very striking illustration of the difference between men's striving to improve one or another individual good quality, and the improving the common Root of all of them, and thereby improving them all at once. The former is the way in which a human artificer works—a statuary, for instance, sometimes making a finger, sometimes a leg, and so on—while the latter, the workmanship of the Divine Artificer, is like the growth of a plant or a tree, in which all the various parts are swelling out and increasing, or, as we term it, *growing*, at the same time. I thought this remark would please my dear Sam[1], so I wrote it down for him. But it teaches us a most important truth, that we should strive to obtain the heavenly principle of growth in grace and in goodness, by obtaining more of the Holy Spirit of God, and then we shall improve in every particular grace or virtue.

But then we must also examine ourselves and recollect, either at night when we go to bed, or in the morning, as we find best (I am always sleepy at night), what have been the instances in which we have chiefly sinned, and thus we shall ourselves discover our besetting sins. But I will write to you on this subject in another letter.

May God bless my dear Boy with His choicest blessings. I am ever his most affectionate father,

W. WILBERFORCE.

Mr. Wilberforce was assuredly as good as his word; and Samuel's characteristic faults, or what were deemed such, are set out in these letters with all plainness, while directions for amendment are given with the utmost care. But what is most important, as bearing on the ultimate formation of his character, is this intense and affectionate earnestness combined with the never wearied iteration with which his father insists on the fundamentals of Christian living; of which, while a few examples have been given above, it may not be superfluous to add the following (bearing date February 24, 1821), in which he begs his son to study a manual of devotion as he would a grammar:—

Let me, however, drop one useful remark, that your uncle Stephen and I were talking the other evening on serious subjects, and we agreed in thinking that the continual action of the Divine Providence has been more and more enforced on us in advancing life, and that the efficacy of prayer also has been rendered still clearer than ever.

Oh, my dearest Samuel, above all things attend to this. Keep steadily to private prayer. Read Bickersteth, not as you read other books, but *as you study a grammar*, to have all the rules so surely fixed in the memory that they may always be called up at the moment for application.

But I must break off. Farewell, my very dear Child. I shall pray for you to-morrow [Sunday] still more earnestly than on a week-day. Farewell.

Intercession is especially kept in view, but, as in the foregoing extract, it is recommended even more by example than by precept. Again and again such sentences recur as the following: 'I shall be praying for you between 1 and 2 P.M.' [or 'between 2 and 3 P.M.'] 'on the day that you receive this.' It was also Mr. Wilberforce's habit to write these letters on the Saturday. 'I do not like,' he writes on March 12, 1819, 'to let a Saturday pass without my sending you a few lines, that when, in the comparative leisure and quiet which my Sunday affords, I am thinking of you, I may be able to indulge the idea that you are reminded of me, and are perhaps reading about me and conversing with me on paper.' At another time, later on, in 1820, he heads a letter with 'Don't read this letter till *Sunday*.' The letter itself is worth a notice as a fresh example of Mr. Wilberforce's thorough way of dealing with all the occurrences of his son's school-life. Samuel had written home about having been beaten in the examination, referred to in the note to page 5, and, after some remarks in reply, Mr. Wilberforce proceeds:—

But what I wish my dearest Boy seriously to consider is that any uneasiness he might feel on account of this occurrence would deserve no better a name than Emulation, which the Apostle enumerates as one of the lusts of the flesh. You should do your business and try to excel in it to please your Saviour, as a small return for all He has done for you, but a return which He will by no means despise. It is this which constitutes the character of a real Christian, that, considering himself as bought with a price—viz. that of the blood of Jesus Christ—he regards it as his duty to try to please his Saviour in everything. And to be honest with you, my very dear Boy, let me tell you that it appears to me very probable that the heavenly Shepherd may have designed by this incident to discover to you that you were too much under the influence of Emulation, and to impress you with a sense of

the duty of rooting it out. Emulation has a great tendency to lessen Love. It is scarcely possible to have a fellow-feeling (*i.e.* duly to sympathise) with any one, if we are thinking much about, and setting our hearts on, getting before him, or his not getting before us. This disposition of mind, which includes in it an over-estimation of the praise of our fellow-creatures, is perhaps the most subtle and powerful of all our corruptions, and that which costs a real Christian the most trouble and pain.

It was in a letter of October 12, 1821, when Samuel was just sixteen, that his father first wrote to him on the subject of seeking Holy Orders. Those who remember the Bishop's eager sympathy with every form of zeal and his utter loathing for a callous lukewarmness, under whatever pretence it might strive to screen itself, will feel an interest in observing how in this early letter the father put zeal 'at the top' of the qualifications of a clergyman. The letter was from Marden Park. It was written at the close of a summer during which Mr. Wilberforce had been able to recruit his health, and he speaks of its being so greatly mended—

that I begin to hope it may please God to spare me to see my dear Sam[l] a minister of Christ, and I think scarcely anything on this side of the grave would gratify me more than to witness him going through the various duties of the ministerial office with ability and zeal. I place zeal at the top, you see. I often think that it is one very bad consequence which follows from good people, really such, associating freely and a good deal with worldly people, that they gradually and insensibly slide into their opinions and practical judgments of men and things—*e.g.* into a too low valuation of the dignity of a clergyman's office. There are so many clergymen who are no better than tradesmen, whether you regard the motives from which they enter the Church or discharge its offices, that their sacred function sinks in the scale below that of the lawyer for instance. But let a TRUE minister of Christ medi-

tate fairly on the subject, and fix in his mind a just sense of the real importance of the ministerial office, and all others fall below it as much as that of a coachmaker, who constructs a vehicle to take you from London to Bath, below that of an architect, who builds a mansion for permanent habitation or a temple for the worship of God.

The following letter of warning may also be given, written on the occasion of some fault on the part of one of Samuel Wilberforce's schoolfellows, which he had failed to bring to the notice of their tutor. It is noticeable also as containing a statement of Mr. Wilberforce's reason for not having sent his sons to public schools :—

(*Private.*)

Near London, November 30, 1821.

My very dear Sam[1],—It is with very different feelings from those which commonly have prevailed in my mind when I begin to write to you, that I now take up my pen : not, however, with less affection, but, as you know how dearly I love you, and are aware that Mr. H. has communicated to me the painful account of the distressing discovery he has lately made, I need not inform you how much I grieve that circumstances which were to put you on your probation, whether or not you would act the Christian or the worldly part, have had a contrary issue to that which my fond partiality would have anticipated.

In what I have just now said, I allude especially to your not having told Mr. H., at the first, the wrong proceedings which you knew to be going forward. This is one of the numerous (they are almost innumerable) class of cases in which worldly honour teaches one lesson and Christian morality another. For the point of honour governs boys in schools with as arbitrary a sway as men in life : and the very same principle which, I suppose, led you not to mention to Mr. H. the misconduct of your schoolfellow, would prompt you, when a man, to obey the laws of honour in fighting

duels, or in all the other instances in which the World goes one way and the servants of Christ another. A very little consideration would have satisfied you that true love of your fellow-creatures, as well as true love towards God (for the love of God is that we keep his commandments, says St. John), would have led you to tell Mr. H. immediately on your first discovering what was going on, unless your schoolfellow would promise you to desist from all such proceedings in future. His fear of your telling Mr. H. would probably have led him to make, and we must hope, if he made, to keep, such a promise, and in that case what pain would you have saved *his* parents as well as your own. What fatal consequences to the young man, as well as what pain, if, as I hope, he has any affection for his parents, would have been prevented had your discovery to Mr. H. of the first improprieties stopped the evil in its beginnings, before it had attained its full magnitude.

When once a youth who has been piously educated gives in to actual vice, there is no saying in what degree the Holy Spirit may be withdrawn, and how far he may be left to sink into greater depths and more settled habits of wickedness. I do think it would almost break my heart and your poor mother's to see you wicked. But God forbid that this should ever be. Yet, my dearest Boy, be assured that many, who once felt as I humbly trust you do at the very possibility of such an event, have afterwards been drawn by insensible degrees into the fullest consummation of it. I cannot but flatter myself that had you thought enough to have had anything like a just notion of the pain you would give to those who love you best, by not acting as a Christian when put upon your trial, that consideration alone would have made you at least mention the matter to *me*.

It has been said, Confidence is a plant of slow growth in the aged bosom, and my bosom is certainly an aged one. Oh, do not destroy the confidence I have been used to repose in you; and only reflect, if you appear one thing to me and quite another of the opposite kind to others of your own age, and I should ever discover this, how can I afterwards know when you are exhibiting your true and when your assumed character. I know that this is often one of the consequences

of a youth's being at a great School, especially if his parents are pious, that he has one set of principles and ways of going on in all respects at school and another at home. But it is chiefly for the very purpose of providing against this double system, that pious parents do not like to send their children to Public Schools. But my eyes even more than my time admonish me to lay down my pen. But let me now, my dear Boy, earnestly conjure you to endeavour to render what has passed the instrument of bringing you to a more earnest endeavour to obtain by fervent prayer the converting grace of God. I know that you are preparing for your examination, but I do not think that you will lose anything in that way by applying yourself in good earnest to the salvation of your soul. Then, Sundays afford you abundant opportunities. I must stop, and cannot read over what I have written, so that if there are any mistakes you know the cause. God bless you. Ever most affy your's,

W. WILBERFORCE.

After this time Mr. Wilberforce's letters often conclude with the single word REMEMBER written in large capitals. The commencement of this custom is chronicled in a letter dated—

Brompton, March 23, 1822.

My dear Samuel,—I am always tempted to conclude my letters with Charles I.'s last word, REMEMBER, which may naturally be supposed to refer to whatever the speaker is known to have most desired to live in the recollection of the person addressed. My dearest Sam[1] well knows, therefore, what *my* REMEMBER means. *Remember* all a father's (let me say a Christian parent's) wishes and prayers for a dearly-loved child's temporal and eternal happiness, and endeavour to have them realised. For this end, as the Apostle says, 'watch unto prayer,' that is, maintain such a state of mind and affections as may render you fit at any time almost to compose your spirits and engage in that blessed exercise. *Remember*, again, to walk by faith and not by sight. *Remember* 'to do all in the name of the Lord Jesus,' that is, to bear in mind that He is always present with you, that He witnesses all your thoughts, words, and actions, and that as

His servant, His friend, His purchased possession, you ought always to be living to His glory. My dearest Samuel, I always run insensibly into a serious strain when I write to you from the heart rather than from the head. Ever your aff^te^ father,

W. WILBERFORCE.

On March 30, 1822, when Samuel Wilberforce was sixteen and a half years old, his father wrote him a letter of advice as to his first communion, which was then approaching, naming to him books, and special passages in books which he wished him to use. But it is curious to find from a letter of nearly a year later, viz. December 5, 1822, that Mr. Wilberforce was not altogether disposed to indulge his son's wishes as to newspapers :—

You desired me to send you a newspaper, and Mr. J—— says you wished it not to be the 'Sun.' I grant that the newspaper of that name has not all the light and fire of the luminary whose name it bears. Yet I sometimes doubt if I do right in sending you the 'Statesman,' which you know is edited by that worst of varlets, Cobbett. Were it the 'Times,' or even the 'Mor^g^ Chronicle,' I should not think it right to put it into your hands. But the 'Statesman' has really appeared to me in general to be so very bad, so manifestly dictated, wherever there is any discussion, by a wish to produce discontent and confusion, that I have thought it would rather disgust all well-regulated minds.

The time was now rapidly approaching for Samuel Wilberforce to go into residence at Oriel, whither his brother Robert had already preceded him, and his father's letters naturally become more anxiously impressive than ever. The following are specimens :—

London, June 14, 1823.

My very dear Samuel,— . . . No business is so important to me as that which concerns the well-being of my children ; but I am not seldom *cheated* out of my time, and so it is at

this very moment. I knew the Archbishop of Dublin was to breakfast with me, and I had desired Mr. Wilson, of Casterton, an excellent man, to come in a little before the hour the Bp. had named for leaving me, wishing to introduce Mr. Wilson to him in conformity to a principle I hold to be of first-rate importance, and which I recommend to you early in life. It is a principle on which for many years I have acted. It is that of bringing together all men who are like-minded, and who may probably at some time or other combine and concert for the public good. Never omit any opportunity, my dear Sam[l], of getting acquainted with any good man or any useful man—of course, I mean that his usefulness in any one line should not be countervailed by any qualities of an opposite nature from which defilement might be contracted,—more perhaps depends on the selection of acquaintances than on any other circumstances in life, except, of course, still more close and intimate unions. Acquaintances are indeed the raw materials from which are manufactured friends, wives, husbands, &c. I wish it may please God to give you an opportunity of having some good ones to chuse out of on your first settling at Oxford. Sir —— —— seems a very pleasing young man, but I own I covet a much higher praise for my sons, and O that I could have reason to believe that they were steadily and sturdily setting themselves to the work of acting on that beautiful as well as forcible description of the character of true Christians which we had 2 or 3 mornings ago in our family service, '*Among whom ye shine as* LIGHTS *in the world*, holding forth the word of Life.' O my dearest Sam[l], what would I give to see you a *φωστὴρ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*. O my dearest Boy, *aim high*, don't be satisfied with being hopeful, still less with being merely not vicious. How little do you know to what services Providence may not call you. If, when I was about your age, any one had pointed to me and said, 'That youth will in a few years (not above 7 or 8) be member for the first county in England,' it would have been deemed the speech of a madman. But I can truly say that I would as much rather see you a Dan[l] Wilson or a Buchanan, as Eternity is beyond any given portion of time in the estimate of a reasonable being.

There is one particular in your composition which you must watch closely, lest it greatly injure your advance in the Christian life. I mean the dread of ridicule, and, as incurring it, the fear of singularity. Singularity for its own sake I grant is worse than folly: so thought St. Paul also. But we shall find it next to impossible to face it when it is our duty to do so, unless we diligently cultivate the habits of judgment and of feeling, by which alone we shall be able to withstand it when duty requires. My time and my eyesight are both expended, and I must stop, not, however, without assuring you how earnestly I shall pray for you to-morrow *inter silvas Mardeni*, 'that you may be strengthened with might by the Spirit in the inner man.' . . . Ever most affy your's,

W. WILBERFORCE.

The reader will not fail to notice Mr. Wilberforce's injunctions about 'bringing people together,' and about seeking the acquaintance of capable and useful men: two maxims of which the future Bishop's life was a continuous illustration. The following is from a letter written a few days before Samuel Wilberforce went to Oxford:—

Barmouth, Sunday, October 12, 1823.

My dearest Saml,— . . . Your time for going to Oxford being at hand, and, above all, the subject on which I have to write to you being such as well becomes this day, it may justly occupy a part of it. [Do not wonder at my letters being sometimes irregularly formed, and at my lines not being accurately horizontal. My eyes have been weakened by indisposition, and are worse than usual. I therefore look at my paper only at the beginning of a word, or indeed less frequently.] If my memory does not mislead me I scarcely enough endeavoured to impress a most important, and what Lord Bacon would have termed a pregnant consideration, arising out of your past and your present circumstances. You are the son, my dearest Saml, of parents who I can truly declare have made your eternal interests the grand object of their care, and who on this principle selecting not only your

tutor, but as far as possible your associates also, have endeavoured to preserve you pure from all contagious influences and from corrupt associates. Now the necessities of life, if I may so express it, require that you should become in a considerable degree your own master—and on the choice you make in this particular very much will depend, even as to what is popularly called your character, but still more as to your estimation by others. For the judgment which men form of others is regulated more, generally speaking, on the quality of the friends they select than on any other particular. But in this instance—and this is chiefly what I alluded to as that which I had not duly enforced—you, as *my* son, will be tried by a different standard from that which is commonly referred to, and be judged by a more rigorous rule; for it would be folly, rather than merely false delicacy, to deny that from various causes my character is more generally known than that of most men in my rank in life. What I now wish to impress on you is, Remember, my dear[t] Boy, that you have *my* credit in your keeping as well as your own.

Never be shy in asking me for any money you want, and pay ready money for everything, so far as you can do it with propriety and comfort. Be strongly on your guard against incurring any small debts with companions, &c., and then forgetting them. I have known persons, who I believe really did offend through inadvertency, bring on themselves the charge of roguery and meanness from little failures of this kind; and here let me also advise, in all cases of joint expenses, as on parties, &c., always be on the forward and generous side. The difference in a whole year would never probably amount to 20*l.*, while the effect on your estimation would be 10 times the amount. Besides, I am sure I need hardly remind you that any one who professes Christian principles should carefully guard against bringing any discredit on them by any part of his conduct. Any action that should savour of parsimony would be charged on his principles. Yet here I should remark that I have often observed people will bear very well your being sparing on many of these occasions on which it is the general practice to be profuse and to make a display, if you can contrive to impress on them that it is not

from the want of generosity that you are economical, but from your own peculiar views of duty. I have found giving presents to people please them exceedingly, and produce an impression of great liberality, and purchase the right (if I may use the expression) of being, with impunity, much more moderate than common in other cases of general expenditure —by with impunity I mean without bringing on any reflections or imputations of parsimony—*e.g.*, when I liv'd a bachelor in London, and wish'd to give away as much as possible,[9] I saw the best way of saving money was to lessen my establishment. I kept no country-house; my only residence was a smallish house in Palace Yard. My dinners and all my apparatus were less expensive than those of any people of my rank and fortune. But I always took care to maintain hospitality, and I used to give freely dinners and suppers to members of Parliament, which consumed, comparatively speaking, very little either of my money or time, but which, as they could not be imputed to a disposition to show off a splendid sideboard, &c. &c., suited people's convenience, and made me extremely popular, and quite excluded all ideas that in the more important particulars in which I saved my money I was influenced by any narrow-mindedness.

And in the first letter which Samuel Wilberforce received from his father, after settling in college, dated Barmouth, October 14, 1823, occurs the following:—

There is one practice I remember your one day mentioning to me, and I am sorry I did not recollect to name it to you again before you left us, that of friends breakfasting with each other on Sunday mornings. I own to you I think it a very injurious one, and the less excusable because at that early hour of the day the spirits of young men especially can need no such cordial. If you wish it I will hereafter give you my sentiments on this point more at large. For the present let it suffice to say that there are few things not actually sin-

[9] The amount of Mr. Wilberforce's charities was very large. Years after the date here referred to, and when he had been obliged to diminish them largely, a single year's almsgiving, &c. exceeded 3,000*l.*

ful (for I do not call this such, but inexpedient) so likely to impair spirituality of mind in the religious exercises of the day.

Again and again during Samuel Wilberforce's undergraduateship did his father's letters reiterate this caution as to the Sunday breakfast-party; a reiteration which will have been observed in the case of other specimens of his counsels which have been quoted. It will have been seen that these last letters were written from Barmouth. Here it was that, as his father's chief companion, Samuel Wilberforce had passed the summer and autumn which intervened between his leaving Mr. Spragge's and going into residence at Oriel. The interval between school and college was one of which Mr. Wilberforce was not likely to underrate the importance, and he was anxious to have his son with him during as much of it as was possible. Samuel's health was not robust, and the air of Barmouth was recommended for him. It was remote, it was then little visited, it was a place where father and son could not but be thrown much upon one another for society. In all respects it exactly suited Mr. Wilberforce's requirements for the summer. We are not left merely to inference or to imagination as regards the effect of the quiet months at Barmouth on the character of the future Bishop. A note-book is still extant, the first in the long series which contain his private memoranda, in which during this summer it was his wont to enter careful notes of his father's conversation, to record his judgments upon men and things, criticisms on books, on sermons, on social habits, copies also of his father's letters to his other children, together with not a few flashes of that vivid humour and lively fun with which Mr. Wilberforce could at all times delight a listener;—all bearing wit-

ness to the stamp which, during those plastic years of youth and boyhood, had been set upon the mind and character of Samuel Wilberforce. The younger Mill has given to the world his own account of the means and methods whereby his expanding intellect was forced into the moulds prepared for it by his preceptor-parent. No such autobiography exists in the case of Samuel Wilberforce, and yet nothing can be clearer than the predominating influence of his father on his early training—an influence, however, which rested altogether upon persuasion, and which addressed itself entirely to the conscience and the affections. As this biography advances, it will have to trace the actions and the character of one whose personality yielded to none in its strongly marked individuality, its force, its tenacity of purpose, its determination to act up to an ideal consciously realised before the mind, and its absolute inflexibility of resolve. No training, however vigorous, could have produced these characteristics of the mind and temper of Samuel Wilberforce. They were the implanted gifts of nature, and of nature only. But the stronger the nature the more firmly does it retain and the more unmistakably does it exhibit through all after years whatever bent or impress has been stamped upon it at the first. Neither could any training, however tender or however skilful, have produced that power of sympathy which did so much to enlarge the scope and to multiply the efficiency of Bishop Wilberforce's talents and activities. That, too, must have been inborn. But moral qualities, such as the sympathy here spoken of, if they are to come out in action, need to be trained and elicited, quite as much as, perhaps even more than, the mental and intellectual faculties. Sympathetic characters are usually sensitive and shrinking; it is their natural instinct to lie close-veiled until

they are sure of a response ; and the ordinary training of English life certainly tends to check the manifestation of feeling even when it burns powerfully below. Fortunately for himself, and for the Church which he was called to serve, it was the exact reverse with Samuel Wilberforce. He was early taught not to repress sympathy, but to express it, to be ready to show kindness of intention and feeling beforehand, and not merely to be kind in action when occasion rose. And all this he was trained to do, not as the indulgence of a sympathetic disposition, but as a matter of self-discipline—as moral duty to those with whom he had to live and act, as religious duty towards God, and as a means of advancing whatever work was given him to do. In the case of Samuel Wilberforce, all these capacities existed, but there was also superadded a training of unrivalled thoroughness, guided by a tender skill, of which the few quotations given above can furnish only a faint impression. And it began at the beginning. It is not too much to say that when that summer at Barmouth ended and Samuel Wilberforce went up to Oriel in October 1823, his father's lessons, moral and social and religious, had done their work. It is not for convenience of division or arrangement, but because of its agreement with actual fact, that the first chapter of Samuel Wilberforce's Life is made to close with his eighteenth year and before the commencement of his undergraduate life.

CHAPTER II.

(1823–30.)

COLLEGE LIFE AND FIRST CURACY.

COLLEGE LIFE AND FRIENDS—'THE UNITED DEBATING SOCIETY:' PARTICULARS OF SAMUEL WILBERFORCE'S SPEECHES AND OPINIONS—DEGREE—FOREIGN TOUR DURING THE SUMMER AND AUTUMN OF 1827—LETTERS WRITTEN DURING THIS TOUR—MARRIAGE—ORDINATION—CURACY AND LIFE AT CHECKENDON—OFFER BY THE BISHOP OF CHESTER OF THE RECTORY OF RIBCHESTER DECLINED—THE BISHOP'S LETTER TO MR. WILBERFORCE ON THE SUBJECT—OFFER BY THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER OF THE RECTORY OF BRIGHSTONE, ISLE OF WIGHT, ACCEPTED.

In the Michaelmas term of 1823 Samuel Wilberforce began his Oxford life as a commoner of Oriel; it being the same term of the same year in which his elder brother Robert, also of Oriel, passed his degree examinations, and obtained a first class both in classics and mathematics. It may be worth while to call to mind that in 1823 Lord Grenville was the Chancellor and Lord Eldon the High Steward of the University of Oxford, with Mr. (afterwards Sir Robert) Peel and Mr. Heber, as its representatives in Parliament. With respect to Oriel, the then Provost was Dr. Copleston, afterwards Bishop of Llandaff; its Tutors were Mr. (afterwards Provost) Hawkins, Mr. (afterwards Dr.) J. Endell Tyler, and Mr. R. W. Jelf, afterwards Canon of Christ Church and Principal of King's College, London; and among its Fellows were Mr. John Keble,[1]

[1] The first mention of Mr. Keble's name occurs in a letter from Mr. Wilberforce to his son Samuel, August 6, 1824, in which he desires him to join H. D. Ryder and Sir G. Prevost in reading classics as private pupils of Mr. Keble.

Mr. J. H. Newman, Mr. E. B. Pusey, and Mr. H. Jenkyns, afterwards Canon of Durham and Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham. The College at that time had seventy-six undergraduates, of whom twenty-one were gentlemen-commoners, including Sir George Prevost, Mr. (now Sir Charles) Anderson, and Mr. Patrick Boyle, all then and afterwards intimate friends of Samuel Wilberforce. Among the commoners were Mr. Bramston, now Dean of Winchester, Mr. H. D. Ryder, Mr. Richard Hurrell Froude, Mr. Robert Hurrell Froude, and Mr. Herman Merivale.

Samuel Wilberforce's entry into residence had just been preceded by the formation of that 'United Debating Society' which a few years afterwards was developed into the 'Union Society,' now so well known to all. Prior to this time there had been various private associations of a similar kind, but in the early part of that year all these had coalesced into the 'United' Society, which from that circumstance took its name, and with the Easter term of 1823 the formal records of its proceedings commenced. Of this Society Samuel's elder brother Robert, his connection, Lord Mahon,[2] and his own and his brother's friend, Sir George Prevost,[3] were active members, and it was only to be expected that Samuel should at once be introduced into it. His activity of mind and his natural turn for speaking soon led him to take a prominent part in its proceedings, and the records of its debates and divisions show him to have been a constant speaker after the middle of his first year's residence. These records have the additional interest of affording clear evidence of the early tendencies of the future Bishop's

[2] Afterwards fifth Earl Stanhope. His mother was the second daughter of Mr. Wilberforce's first-cousin, Robert Smith, the first Lord Carrington.

[3] Now Archdeacon of Gloucester, and Hon. Canon of Gloucester Cathedral.

mind. After his ordination, indeed, as will hereafter be seen, he exhibited for many years a vehement conservatism: but during his undergraduateship he was distinctly liberal, and his opinions more nearly coincided with those which his later judgment would have approved, and which, as is well known, were liberal-conservative as distinguished from those of old-fashioned Toryism. It is to be observed also that his early liberalism led to his being constantly in the minority in the divisions which followed the debates of the Union Society. His second speech, May 29, 1824, acquired public and immediate notoriety.[4] The question was whether Charles I.'s dethronement was justifiable or the reverse; and, though defeated by twenty votes to nine, Samuel Wilberforce, as well as his brother Robert, argued that it was justifiable. It is noticeable that they were the only speakers on that side besides the mover Mr. [afterwards Serjeant] Wrangham; and an attempt was made in the 'John Bull' of that day to make political capital out of the circumstance that two sons of Mr. Wilberforce had defended the deposition of Charles I. On June 5 he spoke against the system of Borough Patronage as being inconsistent with the spirit of the Constitution. Again the two Wilberforces and Mr. Wrangham were the only speakers on the liberal side, but on this occasion they were only in a minority of *one* on the division. On November 6, in the same year, Mr. Wrangham and S. Wilberforce are recorded as maintaining, with only one other speaker, that 'John Hampden deserved the gratitude of his country.' There were eight speakers on the other side, and the motion was lost by twenty-five to fifteen. The Saturday following Mr. S. Wilberforce is recorded as the opener of the

[4] See *Macmillan's Magazine*, vol. 28, pp. 567–8.

debate, moving that 'the passing of the Alien Bill in 1793 was not justifiable or expedient;' again being on the unpopular side and outvoted by eighteen to ten: but it is observable that, however Tory the debating Society was in its general politics, it was distinctly progressive upon the crucial question of popular education, and affirmed, by a majority of thirty against six, the proposition of Mr. Maclean, of Balliol, afterwards M.P. for the city of Oxford, that 'the system of education among the lower orders is likely to prove beneficial to the interests of the country.' On this occasion, Mr. S. Wilberforce is recorded as speaking and voting with the majority, there being nine speakers in favour of education against two only who distrusted it. He was in the minority, however, again (11 against 36) when speaking against fagging in our public schools; when condemning (9 against 32) the character of Queen Elizabeth; and once more he was in a minority of 20, when condemning the erasure of Mr. Fox's name from the Privy Council. On March 12, 1825, he was the mover of a resolution censuring the Union between England and Ireland as proposed in 1799, 'as unlikely to have been beneficial to the latter,' which he carried by 20 to 18. There is a marked consistency and individuality about the course which these examples illustrate, which makes them worthy of notice; while in connection with the last-named subject it is impossible to suppress an incident which exemplifies still further the extraordinary pains which Mr. Wilberforce uniformly bestowed upon his son. Among the letters from his father still extant, to which reference has been so often made already, there is one bearing date February 28, 1825, just a fortnight before the debate in question, giving an elaborate outline of the arguments against the Union from an Irish point

of view. Clearly the son had been applying to the willing father for materials for his speech. The same thing recurs on the only other occasion when S. Wilberforce is recorded as having himself opened a debate —that, namely, when on November 13, 1824, he moved a condemnation of the Alien Bill of 1793. Here, too, it is interesting to find, under date November 3, 1824, a letter of many sheets of the old-fashioned quarto letter-paper filled with information for the son's use. The careful father begins with a few sentences of caution respecting the dangers and temptations of political discussion. And then, having thus discharged his own conscience, he proceeds to satisfy his son's demands by sending him materials enough for a treatise. The opening sentences are too characteristic to be omitted :—

My dear Sam[l] will, I doubt not, excuse me, or rather I trust he will thank my friendly frankness, when I express my fears lest the debating society should occupy too much of your (*sic*) time and thoug'its, and should too greatly interest your feelings. I should deeply regret it if it were to have the effect of making you too much of a politician. At the same time, I am not insensible to the advantages which may result from a man's being accustomed to speak in public. Watch, my dear Sam[l], with jealousy whether you find yourself unduly solicitous about acquitting yourself creditably, whether you are much chagrined when you fail, or are puffed up by your success. Undue solicitude about popular estimation is a weakness against which all real Christians must guard with the most jealous watchfulness. The more you can retain the impression of your being surrounded by a cloud of witnesses of the invisible world, to use the Scripture phrase, the more you will be armed against this besetting sin,—for such it is, though styled the ' last infirmity of noble minds.'

On the subject of Roman Catholic emancipation, which was one of the great questions of the day, Samuel

Wilberforce, during his undergraduateship, took the liberal side, while most of his friends adhered to the traditional Toryism of the day.[5] As regards the regular studies of the University, he read steadily, but moderately, and in course of time a knot of friends came to be formed round the two brothers, Robert and Samuel Wilberforce. Among these should especially be named his connection, Lord Stanhope, then Lord Mahon; Lord Encombe, afterwards Lord Eldon; Sir George Prevost; Mr., now Sir Charles, Anderson; the late Dr. Saunders, Dean of Peterborough; Mr. Patrick Boyle; Mr. Henry D. Ryder; Mr. Trower, afterwards Bishop of Gibraltar; and Mr. Wall, of New College.

The set was sometimes nicknamed the Bethel Union, in consequence both of the prominence in religious matters of the fathers of several of them, and of their own avoidance of Sunday parties. Still there was no unreasonable strictness. Whist was not proscribed, though none of the friends fell in with the high play which at that time was not unknown at Oriel; and, during his whole undergraduateship, Samuel Wilberforce adopted the course which characterised him through life—that, namely, of uniformly taking the most favourable view of persons and of things; and he shrank from positive condemnation of any kind of amusement which might fairly be regarded

[5] Samuel Wilberforce is also reported as maintaining, February 5, 1825, that Napoleon's seizure of power in 1799 was a misfortune for France;—November 27, 1824, that the power of the Crown in England had increased since the Revolution of 1688;—June 11, 1825, that negro slavery ought to be abolished entirely;—October 29, 1825, that a censorship of the Press was undesirable;—June 12, 1824, that the English barons were justified in calling in the French Prince in the days of King John; and, November 12, 1825, that the policy of France towards Spain for the last five years called for the interference of England. It is noticeable that his first speech of all had been to defend Lord North's conduct as regards the War of American Independence.

as innocent, even though it might be objected to on the more rigid rules in which he had been brought up. Not that he was in any haste to break away from the traditions of his education, of which the principles were so permanently engraven on his character. Still, as the course which he followed at the 'Union' has evidenced abundantly, he was not long at Oxford without showing that he must think and act for himself. Though not robust in health as an undergraduate any more than during the early part of his life, he was naturally active and fond of out-door exercise, especially on horseback, and in those days Oxford men had the advantage of Bullingdon Green (now enclosed), where they had ample scope for hurdle-jumping, &c., which used to be his chief amusement in the afternoons, and in which few of his contemporaries were his equals.[6] There was also a scratch pack of harriers kept at Garsington, with which he and his friend Charles Anderson would often fall in, and enjoy taking the fences all round Cuddesdon, then a desolate-looking place, as the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Legge), being Warden of All Souls, resided at his College. Though by no means so exclusively devoted to study as his brother Robert, he took a first class in mathematics, and a second in classics, in the Michaelmas term of 1826. His younger brother, Henry, took a first class in classics and a second in mathematics in 1830; Robert, the eldest brother, having taken a 'double first' in 1823.

After taking such a degree, it might naturally have been expected that Samuel Wilberforce would have stood for an Oriel Fellowship, but he did not, although he was a candidate for a Balliol Fellowship in November 1826, when common opinion picked him out,

[6] On one occasion, for a small wager, he rode over ten flights of hurdles in a hundred yards.

together with Moberly, now Bishop of Salisbury, F. Newman, and Oakeley, as probable winners. Moberly and F. Newman were elected; Oakeley obtained a Chaplain Fellowship a short time afterwards, and Samuel Wilberforce was invited by the Master to offer himself again when a vacancy should occur, but before that time his plans had changed. Indeed, very few months went by after his degree, before marriage and his future profession occupied all his thoughts. His attachment to his future wife had been formed at an unusually early age, and a letter written by him to Mrs. Sargent, in 1844, speaks of it definitely as dating so far back as 1821, when the Sargent family were on a visit to his father, then temporarily residing at Marden Park. Of course no positive engagement was permitted, and the Sargent family would not sanction any correspondence until his undergraduateship was over; but there was no secret about the attachment, and it was never interrupted. So much was this the case that not long after the time referred to (1821) one of his father's letters speaks of 'the great security' which 'a strong virtuous attachment' was to him on his first entering the University. And again, soon after he had taken his degree, his father wrote about it as a thing practically settled, though not made public, the Sargent family insisting on yet a little longer probation and delay. At last, as he would not be old enough to receive Deacon's Orders until the latter end of the year 1828, it was arranged that his marriage should take place in the summer of that year and that his Ordination should follow at Christmas, his father, as the subjoined letter to Mr. Sargent (written December 14, 1827) shows, pleading hard that the marriage should come first:—

The question should be settled by yourself and me, and

really I shall be surprised if we differ after a little interchange of arguments. Considering the extreme importance of the Ministerial office and the duty of entering upon it on as just and pure principles as possible, and with a heart as simply devoted to the holy and weighty trust about to be undertaken, I cannot but think that even connecting it in point of time with his union with the object of so deep and warm, and, considering his age, long standing an attachment as his, and, still more, making the marriage (the period of it I mean) depend on his Ordination, would be highly undesirable, to use the softest term.

Even in other professions it has always been understood that a certain allowance of holidays should be granted on a marriage; and really, my dear friend, I am decidedly of opinion, all circumstances considered, and more especially the spiritual interests of all parties, that the wedding had better not be delayed longer than the month of May or June next, which would allow a few months to elapse before his Ordination. He might then prepare for the solemn service calmly and without distraction, which he must be more than human to do if his being ordained is to be the passport to the matrimonial union. Really, the very imputation that would be justly brought on his desire of entering into Orders as soon as he should be of the required age, would of itself be a discreditable one. I would gladly make up any difference of income that might arise from his not being ordained; and as I am drawn to that topic, let me just remark that, humanly speaking, there is no doubt, if Bp. Sumner lives, of his giving Samuel, if they both live, a liberal competency. Some considerations, to which you are necessarily a stranger, confirm this persuasion in my mind; and really this is a curious instance of the unexpected manner in which Providence kindly fulfils the promise, 'Cast thy bread upon the waters,' &c. I do not allude, I ought to say, to any service I ever rendered to the Bp.'s father or mother.[7]

It may be as well that I should assure you, as I solemnly

[7] An acknowledgment of Mr. Wilberforce's liberality to members of the Sumner family will be found later on (p. 43) in a letter from Bishop J. B. Sumner, of Chester, to Mr. Wilberforce, in which the Bishop speaks of his motives in offering the living of Ribchester to Samuel Wilberforce.

do, that it is not at Sam's suggestion, or with his privity, that I urge on you the expediency of an early union—the expediency—I ought rather to say the absolute duty. And happily I am writing to a friend who agrees with me, and feels (without a compliment) far more strongly, that if it be once clear that any line of conduct is acceptable to God, it becomes our interest no less than our duty to adopt it.

Carefully preserved letters of the period immediately following his leaving the University reveal more particulars of the character of his Oxford friendships than it is possible to obtain in any other way. There are many from Isaac Williams; more, and those singularly affectionate and confidential, from R. Hurrell Froude, several from F. Oakeley, and numerous ones from P. Boyle. Froude and Oakeley had lately become Fellows of Exeter and Balliol respectively, and their letters, though not such as to repay reproducing at length, are full of the current Oxford gossip as well as of more personal matters.[8] From a letter of Froude's, March 17, 1827, we learn that it was not until then that S. Wilberforce finally resolved on entering Holy Orders. 'From what you said, in one of the last conversations I had with you, I thought you seemed more reconciled to the notion of taking Orders early if at all. Of course in a matter of that sort every one must judge for himself,

[8] Among the forgotten incidents referred to in these letters, we may mention that of Dr. Ogilvie's having so nearly been Bishop of Calcutta. F. Oakeley writes much of his intercourse with him, and under date, May 11, 1827, says, 'It [the Bishopric of Calcutta] was actually offered and accepted, but Lord Liverpool's illness caused a change of plan, and Ogilvie was not sorry to be released, though glad he had accepted it.'

And there are traces innumerable of the impression made by Mr. Keble upon his Oxford contemporaries and juniors. One citation must suffice. On March 20, 1827, R. H. Froude writes, 'Unfortunately he [Mr. Keble] is so much engaged that I can see but little of him. Yet that little suffices to bring before me the immeasurable interval which separates him from his fellow-wanderers on earth. There is a sort of deep richness in his observations which gives a resting-place to one's dreary feelings, and helps one to see things through an enchanted atmosphere.'

but I should say by all means be a parson early, if the alternative is not to be one at all.'[9] A letter of F. Oakeley's, February 19, 1827, referring to his own views as to the Balliol Fellowship, to which he was elected on March 23 following, mentions also the fact specified a few pages back, of Samuel Wilberforce having himself entertained, but afterwards given up, the purpose of competing for a Balliol Fellowship. 'Don't say a word at present of my having any views to the Balliol Fellowship. . . . I regret much to hear that you mean to abandon the object at Balliol, but I hope you will think better of this hereafter. What has come of your conference with Ogilvie?' And again, in the letter of March 24, announcing his own success, Oakeley wrote, 'I am always longing for you as a "co-Fellow."' The intimacy was evidently close, as the letter commences with 'After my own family you are among the first who have a claim to be informed of any honours or success which may fall to my share.' There is also a large correspondence at this period with Mr. F. Lyte, to whom is due the favourite evening hymn, 'Abide with me, fast falls the eventide.' A proposal was for a short time entertained for him to be ordained as curate to Mr. Lyte, in which case the future Bishop would have commenced his clerical life among the fishermen of Torbay. It was only owing to some accidental circumstance that Mr. Lyte did not officiate at the marriage of S. Wilberforce and Emily Sargent.

The summer and the autumn, until early in the November of 1827, were spent in a foreign tour. He went abroad in June with Mr. Anderson and Mr.

[9] A few months after this, namely, August 25, 1827, his father wrote to him, 'I rejoice in the prospect of your becoming a clergyman rather than a lawyer, when from your talents and qualifications it appeared by no means improbable that in the legal line you might not improbably rise to the enjoyment of rank and affluence.'

Lyte, but the latter was soon obliged to return home through illness: a circumstance so far fortunate for us, inasmuch as Wilberforce's letters to Mr. Lyte during the remainder of the journey are especially serviceable in exhibiting the formation of his character at this stage of his life. Mr. Anderson and he pursued their journey together. For a short time they were in company with Sir George and Lady Prevost. The tour was that so usual with young men making their first acquaintance with the Continent: the Rhine, Switzerland, Northern Italy as far south as Pisa and Leghorn, Genoa and the Corniche, then, after an interval during which the route is not specified, back viâ Schaffhausen, Strasburg, Cologne, Holland, where he spent a fortnight, Brussels and Waterloo, Rheims, and so to Paris. There he remained three weeks, receiving much kindness from Mrs. Way, which was the more acceptable as he was now alone, Mr. Anderson having parted from him some time before and gone back to England. The following extracts are characteristic:—

Geneva, August 11, 1827.

My dear Mr. Lyte,—. . . You asked me to tell you what I thought of Mr. Malan's doctrines on further consideration. I believe that I exactly agree with you, and I do not believe that that is exactly agreeing with him. Several friends of mine here have been to him, and with one and all his course is exactly the same. He says,—Do you believe? They say,—I hope so. He says,—Supposing you were going to die this moment, to what would you trust, to your own works or to the merits of Christ the Son of God? If you answer,—The latter, he shows you 1 S. John iv. 15, and says,—Then here is the word of God that you are one of the elect. Never mind what your life has been or is, that *must* now amend. Your former sins were from your unbelief. If only you will now believe that you are, as you see you must be, one of the elect, sanctification will follow. Any want of this full convic-

tion of your safety he condemns as a want of faith. Does he not confound faith and *assurance*, and is not this a very dangerous way of proceeding? Malan's argument implies in the strongest way personal election,[1] and I think, by consequence, reprobation. Do you think that these doctrines are contained in the Bible? I was surprised by finding that he never in any of these interviews has said one word of Prayer. I suppose he takes it for granted that all who believe will pray, and that others cannot; but still it seems a great omission. I have no doubt he enforces it in his sermons, but still not to hint at it, in such interviews as those I have already mentioned, seems strange. Pray send me in your answer your opinion on these points.

Monday, 13th.—Since writing the above, I am more convinced of what I have already said to you. In a sermon on the Christian course yesterday, Prayer was only once mentioned *incidentally*, and in bidding us good-bye and giving us his last adieu he never mentioned it. . . .

Samuel Wilberforce appears to have seen a good deal of society in Geneva. His letters mention evenings spent with the Baron de Staël, and speak also of 'our friends Mons. and Mad. Maunoir,' besides many others whose names are less known. In a letter from Milan, dated September 8, 1827, he describes his further route through Northern Italy, and it is observable that his remarks on the picture-galleries which he visited, make no pretension to artistic criticism, but are limited to a few very forcible sentences on the 'moral effects upon his mind' of some of the paintings which he describes. In this letter, too, we have a trait which serves to mark his deepening seriousness:—

We [*i.e.* Mr. Charles Anderson and himself] have of late

[1] It may be worth mentioning that however Mr. W. Wilberforce was identified with the Evangelical School in religion, he was no Calvinist. This appears again and again in his letters. 'You and I, who are no Calvinists,' is an expression which occurs repeatedly.

begun social prayer from our Church Services every morning and evening. Indeed, it now seems to me, as you once, I remember, said when we were together, quite heathenish to travel, eat, and do everything, in short, but pray together. . . .

Of his three weeks' sojourn in Paris we have a reminiscence in a letter to his school and college friend Mr. Patrick Boyle, the first of his letters in which any political[2] remarks occur. A paragraph or two may be quoted :—

Paris, October, 25, 1827.

My dear Boyle,—. . . The state of things here is very curious. The Government are very strong, but it is solely from their immense and most disciplined standing army. They have attached Buonaparte's generals to them, and by these means I should hope they will keep down any civil commotions. Paris is perfectly like a garrisoned town. Every other man almost you meet is a soldier, and the streets are constantly thronged with regiments and marching companies. The Orleans party but for this would, I gather, stir up a revolution within a week's time. The number of spies is immense, *English* and French. If young Napoleon was to march into France, backed by 20,000 Austrians, they say not a man would stick to the Bourbons. Thus Austria has an immense hold on France and French politics.

As to Home politics, I do not think the question is now between Whigs and Tories. It seems to me that the present Ministry is formed on the principle of raising the Commons at the expense of the aristocratical party, both Whig and Tory. Peel is in his heart, I should gather from his past conduct, one of these, and I should think will before long be again in, with at least a part of the present Ministry. Now, I for one should like to see some few things conceded to the lower classes, as I think we have some privileges which justice requires they should share. The Corn Law Amendation (*sic*), the Game Laws, &c., are to me of these. But I dread such

[2] The letters from Mr. Patrick Boyle to Samuel Wilberforce of this and some subsequent years are numerous, and are chiefly remarkable for their lively and active interest in all the political movements of the time.

men as Brougham, and *rather* Huskisson, and the sweeping so-named Reforms which their selfish desire to raise their party, the skum (*sic*), not to their just rights, but to a most iniquitous and monstrous preponderance, would introduce. Thus I do not agree with you or with them. But I am trying to moderate my political feelings, which only become a clergyman, I think, when mildly held. . . .

The second week in November found Samuel once more at home in his father's house, Highwood Hill, Middlesex. Thence he went on to Niton in the Isle of Wight, on a visit to the Sargents, who were wintering there, and the time of his marriage having now been definitely fixed for the following June, the interval was divided between reading, or trying to read, for Ordination at Highwood Hill, and visiting his future wife's family at Niton and at Lavington.

On June 11, 1828, St. Barnabas' day—Barnabas, the son of Consolation, as he used often to say with satisfaction,—Samuel Wilberforce and Emily Sargent were married in Lavington Church, Mr. C. Simeon, his father-in-law's old friend, officiating on the occasion.

Returning in the autumn from their wedding tour, S. Wilberforce and his bride had still a few months of leisure prior to his ordination and to settling down to the work of life. The interval was naturally spent at Lavington and at Highwood, with the single exception of a visit at the end of November to the Bishop of Winchester at Farnham Castle. It had been the wish both of S. Wilberforce and of his father that he should begin his clerical life in the diocese of his father's friend, Bishop C. R. Sumner, of Winchester, and the Bishop himself was anxious to forward their plan. No title, however, was found which was regarded as in all respects eligible; and although the Sargents pressed his acceptance of the curacy of Chiddingfold in Surrey,

between Godalming and Petworth, of which their friend Dr. Pearson,[3] the Dean of Salisbury, was Rector, it was declined in favour of the sole charge of Checkendon, near Henley-on-Thames.[4] There was much to recommend Checkendon. The parish and the church were small, the rectory was a sufficient house; and it was but eighteen miles from Oxford, whence clerical assistance could easily be obtained if requisite, especially as his brother Robert was still in residence at Oriel. Robert was now Tutor of his College, having been—so Mr. Wilberforce wrote a little before—'almost compelled to accept the tutorship on the preferment of Mr. Hawkins to the Provostship. The tutorship had been offered to Robert some time before, but declined.'[5] Another recommendation to Checkendon in the eyes of S. Wilberforce's parents lay, as their letters testify, in 'its vicinity to Mr. Sumner,' *i.e.* to

[3] Though approving of this curacy as being in the Winchester diocese, S. Wilberforce's family regarded it as likely to prove too laborious, his lungs giving some cause for anxiety, and because the Bishop of Winchester—so writes Mrs. Wilberforce—'insists much on two sermons in every parish church every Sunday, and in many recommends three.'

It may be added that at one time (April 1828) there was a negotiation for a title from Mr. (afterwards Bishop) Daniel Wilson at Islington.

[4] Not, however, without taking the Bishop of Winchester's advice, who thus writes to Mr. Wilberforce:—

'66, Portland Place, June 13, 1828.

'My dear Sir,—The circumstances of the curacy offered to your son are such that I cannot advise his declining to avail himself of it. It would have been very agreeable to me, had a desirable opening in my diocese presented itself to him; but it is so difficult to find what is suitable at the precise time when it is wanted, that I think it would be imprudent for him to pass by the present offer. If, however, anything should arise to prevent his settling at Checkenden (*sic*), or after having been settled there to remove him from it, it will give me great satisfaction to see him come into my diocese . . . . I am ever, my dear Sir, your faithful and obliged servant,

'C. WINTON.'

[5] It would seem that Robert Wilberforce—afterwards Archdeacon of the East Riding,—was even now anxious to exchange college for parochial work. In a few months afterwards we find Samuel Wilberforce writing of him, under date March 29, 1829: 'He is, I think, longing for an escape from Oxford. He would have accepted Ribchester, he says, if offered to *him*.'

Mr. J. B. Sumner, then Vicar of Mapledurham, at no great distance from Checkendon, but who before S. Wilberforce was actually ordained was removed from the neighbourhood by his promotion to the Bishopric of Chester. Accordingly, on Sunday, December 21, 1828, after having been examined by Dr. Burton, S. Wilberforce was ordained Deacon in Christ Church Cathedral by Bishop Lloyd, then Bishop of Oxford, and in about a month afterwards entered upon his duties.

Mr. Wilberforce had not over-estimated the friendly feelings of the Sumner family, for before Samuel had been two months at Checkendon the recently consecrated Bishop of Chester (J. B. Sumner) offered him the vicarage of Ribchester, near Preston, in Lancashire, a small living with a considerable population, in a 'situation which must be considered'—so wrote the Bishop, February 26, 1829—'as a remote and solitary one, not to say desolate;' but 'that the neighbourhood of Stoneyhurst makes it very necessary to send to Ribchester a man of both zeal and ability.' The terms in which the offer was made were unquestionably flattering, but it is needless to say that nearly every reason which had made Checkendon desirable rendered Ribchester undesirable, so that the offer, after full consultation with his father, was declined. It is worth noticing, however, that Mr. Wilberforce looked deeper than the merely external considerations involved, and wrote, on March 17, 1829:—

> Perhaps, my dear Samuel, I ought to tell you that in the reasons I assigned to the Bishop for declining his offer, one, and in itself perhaps the strongest, (nay, certainly so, not perhaps,) was my persuasion that for any one educated and associated as you have been, it was of very great importance, with a view to your spiritual state (more especially for the cultiva-

tion of devotional feelings and spirituality of mind), that he should, in the outset of his Ministerial course, be for some time in a quiet retired situation, where he would live in the enjoyment of leisure for religious reading and meditation and devotional exercises; while, on the contrary, it was very undesirable, in lieu of these, to be placed in circumstances in which he would almost necessarily be almost incessantly arguing for Protestant principles—in short, would be occupied in the Religion of the Head rather than of the Heart.

Bishop J. B. Sumner's letter to Mr. Wilberforce on the subject should also be given at length:—

Wandsworth, March 16, 1829.

My dear Sir,—Thank you for your very kind letter. I could hardly expect your son Sam[1], with all his connections southward, to strike his tent and take up his lot with me in Lancashire; but I could not refuse my diocese and myself the chance of obtaining his assistance; and I certainly was happy to have an opportunity of showing that if I could have benefited a son of yours, it would be the first object of my desire to do so.

I think his reasons for declining it sufficiently strong; only let me vindicate myself from the idea of involving you in expense, as I certainly considered a convenient house, and a *certainty*, and 200*l. per ann.*, better than a curacy like Checkendon; and, indeed, one of my anxious wishes was to relieve you from expense, knowing as I do your great liberality[6] to members of our family.

I have no time to add more, except my kind regards to Mrs. Wilberforce and your daughter, and remain always, my dear Sir, with the highest esteem, your faithful and obliged,

J. B. CHESTER.

Checkendon is a quiet little country village, amid the low hills and woods to the south-west of Henley-on-Thames. Its population did not exceed three hundred, so that Samuel Wilberforce had ample opportunity for the study and meditation necessary for

[6] See *ante*, page 34.

one who was preparing for admission into Priest's Orders.[7] The church is remarkable as being one of the very few Norman churches in this country in which the original apsidal chancel remains unchanged,[8] and in which a considerable part of the original twelfth-century frescoes on the chancel wall remains uninjured.[9] It is also singularly picturesque as well as architecturally interesting, and it was restored in the year 1869, happily in a most conservative spirit. One of Bishop Wilberforce's last episcopal acts as Bishop of Oxford was that of preaching at its re-opening on August 2, 1869.

His life at Checkendon was almost absolutely devoid of incident. Such of his letters as have been preserved tell of a cheerful, happy time, enlivened by visits from his Oxford friends: they contain frequent references to the disturbed condition of the rural population; and they exhibit his opinions as undergoing a powerful reaction towards Toryism, which, as will hereafter be seen, lasted during the greater part of the next ten years. His letters to his father are full of details of his parochial experience, and of remarks on the books which he was reading; and, finally, they abound in indications of that love for natural history, of birds especially, which afterwards distinguished him. To his friend Mr. Patrick Boyle he wrote:—

Checkendon, March 30, 1829.

My dear Boyle,—I have been so busy getting into my curacy, getting things a little comfortable around me, and, above all, writing sermons, that I have made but a bad corre-

[7] He was ordained priest in Christ Church Cathedral, December 20, 1829.

[8] St. Michael's, Newhaven, Sussex, is another example, which will be familiar to many readers.

[9] An elaborate account of these wall-paintings, supposed to be of the twelfth century, was read by Mr. E. G. Bruton, architect, before the Oxford Architectural Society, in May, 1868.

spondent to any of my friends, and to yourself amongst the number. However, since Peel has ratted, since the great majorities in the Commons, since Lord Winchelsea has been shot (through the lappet), and since the Scotch meeting and Sir Walter's conversion, I could no longer postpone sending you a few lines to ask how in these evil days you continued. I hope that now at least you will allow the justice of my often disputed character of 'candied' orange Peel, and allow that he has shewn himself either a rogue or a poltroon, not, indeed, by changing now, but by having continued for five years to pretend to head the Protestant party, when he in 1825 wished to resign from his conviction that Emancipation could no longer be refused. . . . My curacy is in a very pretty country, amidst a very quiet, retired population. The vicinity of Oxford, too, is very pleasant, as enabling me to obtain Robert's assistance and to see old friends. Amongst those who have already been here are Osborne, Ryder, Oakeley, Froude, and, of course, my brothers and Rogers. Anderson is coming to stay with me in the spring, and I look forward to his visit with great pleasure.

And again, on September 10, 1829, to the same :—

'As to politicks, Sir,' I don't know what to say are my opinions. I was once, as you know, a Radical. I believe I am now, with some exceptions, a very high Tory. I quite agree with you that the state of things seems to forebode some storm, some great and violent convulsion, before equanimity can be restored to the apparently jarring elements of our political constitution. And I agree with you that there can be no safe, wise, or vigorous administration until what I consider pure Tory principles shall prove its foundation. I am not quite certain that we should exactly agree in our definition of a Tory. I think that not only our country, but almost all the Continental nations, evince this same approaching fate. I cannot say that I expect any very prosperous result will spring from it ; for my own belief is that things will grow worse and worse. I think that the Church will fall within fifty years entirely, and the State will not survive it much

longer. The post is going out, and I shall, therefore, lose my frank if I do not close. Ever, my dear Boyle, very sincerely your's,

SAML. WILBERFORCE.

In letters to his father he comments frequently on the Antinomian tendencies of the few Dissenters in his neighbourhood; and he severely criticises the biography of Legh Richmond, by Mr. Grimshawe, on the score of its denial of baptismal regeneration, more particularly for its claiming Hooker's concurrence, when the passages appealed to turned out to be, not Hooker's at all, but those in which he was quoting Cartwright, his opponent. With reference to subsequent controversies on this doctrine, it is worth noticing that Mr. Wilberforce held it firmly. A letter from Henry Wilberforce to his brother Samuel is still extant, written from Mr. Daniel Wilson's house at Islington, in which he thus refers to a discussion between his father on the one hand, and Mr. Wilson and Mr. Cunningham on the other:—'Papa defended *most strongly* baptismal regeneration against the two clergymen. His ground was that we are told that no man can see God without a change of heart. We believe that infants do see God, and therefore he did not doubt that their hearts were changed at baptism.'

At this period also he wrote to his brother Robert, begging him to send him 'any old tidy and not expensive copy of the Eikôn Basiliké you can procure me. I should hate a new edition, though I suppose there is not one. I want this not merely on the general ground that it is a shame for an Englishman, and above all a clerk, to be without this work of the blessed martyr's, but also because I want to read it.' He wrote to him also for advice and direction on pastoral and clerical questions, and among other things he said, 'I cannot

make up my mind as to enforcing the having communicated on godfathers. The only infant I have as yet refused still waits, because they can get no such sponsors. What is your advice?'

And so Samuel Wilberforce passed the first months of his clerical life in the quiet of the little rural parish of Checkendon. To say 'first years' would be inaccurate, for by the time that he had been about sixteen months at Checkendon, Bishop Sumner, of Winchester, made good the kind expressions of the letter quoted above,[1] and offered him the pleasant Rectory of Brighstone, in the Isle of Wight, to which he was inducted June 12, 1830. The following letter to his brother gives a sufficient account of the place and its circumstances :—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Wednesday, June 16 [1830], Lavington.

My dearest Robert,—I do not like to let a day pass after my return from Brixton, or, as it *is* pronounced and *was* spelt, Brĭghsŏn, without answering your very kind letter. Our plan at present is to stay at Checkendon for about six weeks longer, and then move to Brighson. On Saturday I was inducted by the Rev. G. Richards, brother to Marsh's old tutor of the same name. On Sunday I read (myself) in, and buried a poor old woman. On Monday I arranged matters about furniture and so forth, and met Mr. Sargent, Mary, Caroline, Sophia and Harry at Newport, returned with them, went over the place with them, and returned again to Ryde. On Tuesday we spent the morning with Sir H. Thompson and returned late last night here.

Brighson is a very pretty village, the cottages are neatly built of stone and thatched. They are sprinkled about and interspersed with elm-trees. The church is a very pleasant, pretty edifice. The rectory is a capitally complete house for what it does contain; anything more entirely complete for a bachelor's house you never saw; but for a family house it

[1] See *ante*, page 41.

will not do without some alterations. . . . The principal inhabitants are yeomen farmers who have inherited their farms from their ancestors, time without mind. The register goes back as far as 1645, and therefore, of course, bears Bp. Ken's[2] handwriting. The income is not, I believe, above 500*l.* a year. I pray God it may be a sphere for useful labour; it is one, I already see, of much more difficulty than Checkendon. . . . Ever your most affectionate brother,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

Thus while yet under five-and-twenty, and when he had been scarcely six months in Priest's Orders, Samuel Wilberforce was already entering on his career as a beneficed clergyman. His Checkendon apprenticeship had been a short one indeed, and since the Rector was non-resident he had had to work out his own methods for himself, unaided by the experience and guidance of an older clergyman. But there are abundant indications that the sixteen or seventeen months in his Oxfordshire curacy had not been unimproved; and that, above all, those habits of close personal dealing with individuals, as well as of keen personal interest in the welfare of those with whom he had to do, which afterwards distinguished him, had been already brought into action in the little secluded village of three hundred souls. The present Rector writes:—

I have heard how people liked the sort of lectures which he gave on Sunday afternoons in a simple conversational style on the Gospels. Another time I heard of the earnestness with which he prayed for a boy in the village in whom he was much interested, who seemed at the point of death, and how those who heard him attributed the boy's recovery to those prayers. It may seem a trifle, but it serves to mark the difference between those days and the present, if I add that he used to be very much annoyed at the coal for warming the church being kept in a box *inside the chancel*, but could never

[2] Bishop Ken was Rector of Brighstone from 1667 to 1669 or 1670.

persuade the Rector to have it moved. One of his first acts as Bishop of Oxford was (in a good-tempered letter to him) to direct its removal. He also instituted Saints' Day services.

There was a poor woman in Checkendon who was too infirm to go to church, with whom S. Wilberforce used to read and pray regularly every week, and who had obtained leave for some of her friends to be present at what became a kind of cottage service. When his departure took place, he said on leaving that Mrs. Whitfield was not to expect anything from him; but the fact proved very different, for through all the rest of her life, more than thirty years, he never once omitted sending her a present at Christmas, sometimes a book, sometimes a warm garment, sometimes money to buy fuel.

One only circumstance occurred to bring a shadow over this period of the married life of the young couple. This was the death, on October 21, 1829, of the elder of Mrs. S. Wilberforce's two brothers, John Garton Sargent,[3] an undergraduate of Trinity College,

[3] A few family particulars may be added in this place :—

John Sargent married (as stated above, page 6) Mary, only daughter of Abel Smith, Esq., elder brother of Lord Carrington, and had children:—

John Garton,	*b.* 1808, *d.* 1829.
Henry Martyn,	*b.* 1816, *d.* 1836.
Emily,	*b.* 1807, *m.* S. Wilberforce 1828, *d.* 1841.
Mary,	*b.* 1811, *m.* H. W. Wilberforce 1834, *d.* 1878.
Caroline,	*b.* 1812, *m.* H. E. Manning 1833, *d.* 1837.
Sophia Lucy,	*b.* 1814, *m.* G. D. Ryder 1834, *d.* 1850.

The name Garton was that of the original builder of Lavington House, Gyles Garton, citizen of London, who was succeeded in the estate by his son, Sir Peter Garton, knight, in 1593. Sir Peter's only daughter and heiress married R. Orme, Esq., whose grandson, Garton Orme, M.P. for Arundel, died in 1758. His daughter and heiress married R. Bettesworth, Esq., who left one daughter, Charlotte Orme, his sole heiress. She married John Sargent the elder, who built the present house, and died in 1831, only two years before his son John Sargent the younger, the Bishop's father-in-law.

Cambridge, who, after a considerable period of declining health, finally succumbed to that scourge of English families, consumption. On the other hand, their first child,[4] Emily Charlotte (who married the Rev. J. H. Pye), was born April 25, 1830, just a month before the offer was made to him of the Rectory of Brighstone.

[4] The other children were—

Herbert William, *b.* June 29, 1833, *d.* Feb. 29, 1856.
Agnes Everilda, *b.* Jan. 4, 1837, *d.* same day.
Reginald Garton, *b.* Jan. 23, 1838.
Ernest Roland, *b.* Jan. 22, 1840.
Albert Basil Orme, *b.* Feb. 14, 1841.

more which, though incapable of reproduction, is of the highest value to a biographer, both as guarding him from misstatement as to points of fact, and as revealing the bent and purpose of its writer's mind. It is this, even more than his unreserved and open-hearted letters to his friends, which exhibits the Brighstone period as that during which all that was special and characteristic alike in his social and his clerical character was brought out and matured. More even than this may be said; for, even during this early period, all that peculiar capacity for winning influence over others, and that tendency to be ever widening his sphere of activity and extending his range of action, are to be seen continually developing themselves. He was barely twenty-five when he first took up his abode in that rural rectory, his own master, in a settled position, with sufficient, if not ample, means, with a parish not too laborious either as regards extent or population, with a pleasant home in an agreeable neighbourhood, and with, as the diary shows, numberless friends who were only too happy to visit him. It must have been a very pleasant time. Memories of his cheerful hospitality still survive among those who were his early friends, and who speak of it as already foreshowing those unrivalled social powers and qualifications which afterwards distinguished him. The Bishop of Winchester, too, was a frequent guest, especially during the earlier portion of his incumbency, while, after its first two or three years were over, six months rarely went by without Samuel Wilberforce being his Bishop's guest, either at Farnham Castle or at Winchester House, and, in the majority of cases, for a week or ten days at a time. With most men such circumstances might have been favourable to the development of all that was amiable and pleasing in the mind and manners of a refined and cultivated clergy-

man, but they would hardly have conduced to the formation of a vigorous and striking public character, still less of one so remarkable for strenuous purpose and for unremitting industry. With Samuel Wilberforce, the case was distinctly otherwise. With him, freedom from control and an independent position were but the opportunity for shaping his own course and for the free development of energies which a different position might have checked or impeded. And there can be no doubt whatever, that it was largely owing to these circumstances that, at an age when, so far as public life is concerned, men have rarely had the opportunity of coming to their full stature, Samuel Wilberforce was already a trained and experienced man, and, what is not less important, that his powers and his qualifications were already known and appreciated. A student in the technical sense of the word, Samuel Wilberforce never was. He was never a great reader simply for reading's sake. Neither was he what is called a profound thinker. On the other hand, it would be difficult to imagine a mind or a temperament of more ceaseless activity, one which was more sensitively alive to every question of the day, one which pondered all such subjects with more anxious and persistent thought, or one which fastened with keener eagerness, or greater acuteness of perception, upon every means of information which either books or men supplied. But as a man of action he was in his element, and public questions were his delight. From the very first days of his Brighstone life he appears always full of vivid interest in some public object, and with an instinctive tendency to strike out from his own centre and gather others into a circle round him, with the practical object of enlisting and directing their force towards whatever aim he had in view. And the great

interest of these Brighstone years lies in this, that they exhibit him, so to speak, steadily working from the centre outwards, first mastering his own parish, then, young as he yet was, becoming unquestionably the most stirring personage among the island clergy; and then, after not a few striking appearances in London and elsewhere, and after the brilliant episode of his Propagation Society tour in the counties of Devon and Cornwall during the autumn of 1839, promoted at four-and-thirty to the Archdeaconry of Surrey. But during all this period his interest in public affairs, Church matters especially, is unremitting, and from the letters which will be quoted it will be seen how closely he was following the course of thought and of events, yet from a standpoint of his own and with an independence of judgment which commands our notice from the beginning. Especially as regards the now historical, but at that time novel, Tractarian movement in the University of Oxford, there is a freedom of criticism and a balance of judgment which seem to show that, if his mind were capable of fear, that fear was the dread of surrendering his judgment into the keeping or guidance of another. He was a Churchman, and a High Churchman from the first; men like R. Hurrell Froude and F. Oakeley were among his intimate associates: he repeatedly expresses the keenest admiration for the intellect and the powers of John Henry Newman, yet for all this it is the more observable that all through these early years he maintained a position external to that great Oxford movement, to whose forces it was hereafter to be his special mission to give unity and direction.

But we have to begin at the beginning.

Early, then, in the September of 1830, and within three months of his induction, his diary shows him

settled in his new home; his father, his mother, his sister Elizabeth, his brother Robert, with R. Hurrell Froude, all with him, and the Bishop of Winchester and Mrs. Sumner also coming for a two days' visit. The diary is full of details about the persons in the parish whom he had to visit, his special difficulties with each, his hopes and his fears about them, his plans, the books which he was reading, and the like. Thus, for example—

Oct. 15.—A good deal hurt at the hold the Wesleyans appear to have on the better disposed among my people. Lord, overrule it for good.

Oct. 17.—Read a good deal of Dr. Stewart, of Moulin. My mind a good deal distracted both as to the mode and the effect of his ministry.

Oct. 21.—Wrote to the minister of Moulin to ask the character of Dr. Stewart's converts.

Jan. 5, 1831.—Much perplexed by Russell and the Baptists. Talked some time with him.

Then, in the midst of a series of notes of the same character with the above occurs the following, which shows that his love of natural history, especially as regards birds, had become known already among his parishioners:—

Oct. 20.—A widgeon brought me to-night, a hen, or not in full plumage, a beautiful bird caught at Newtown by the fishermen.

At the same time, these daily records show him to be learning the Epistle to the Ephesians by heart, noting how much is learned each day. For months together the course of preparation of each sermon is specified, together with memoranda as to its efficiency when delivered. These notes exhibit him as reading steadily through such books as Clarendon, Mosheim, Davison on Prophecy, Hooker for a second and a third

time, Archbishop Leighton, Bishop Jebb, A. Knox's 'Remains,' Bishop Kaye's 'Tertullian,' a little Hebrew, together with Owen and Romaine, with a memorandum, as to this last, that his father cautions him that 'Mr. Newton had told him that more of Mr. Romaine's people had become Antinomians than any other that he knew of.'

On his first arrival in his parish, his youthful appearance led to the exclamation, 'Why, they've sent us a boy!' But after his first sermon the same speaker said, 'I thought he was a boy, but I see he's a man.'[1] And indeed it is unquestionable that from the first the day's work of Samuel Wilberforce in the parish of Brighstone was the day's work of a man. A second sermon was immediately added on the Sunday, together with frequent catechizing in the afternoon service. A week-day evening service in the church, with sermon, was

[1] The Bishop was in the habit of telling the two following anecdotes respecting the early days of his incumbency of Brighstone.

On his first visit to the parish after receiving the offer of the living the principal farmer asked him, 'Be you going to keep the meadow (a small one on the glebe) in your own hands?' 'Why?' asked Mr. S. Wilberforce. 'Well, Parson, you see, when late Rector had it he used to cut his grass when I cut mine, and his being only a little piece, in course he gets his up while most of mine be lying about; and then sure enough the very next Sunday he claps on the prayer for rain—so if you don't mind I'd like to rent that meadow from you.'

It is needless to add that the good man was reassured. The second story—a great favourite of the Bishop's, was somewhat different, and used to be adduced by him as an example, not merely of the character of his parishioners, but of the need of great explicitness in preaching.

Brighstone had a bad name alike for wrecking and for smuggling, so before long Mr. S. Wilberforce took occasion to preach a sermon specially against the latter, and his text was the verse 'Render unto all their dues: *custom to whom custom*,' &c. The next morning, being half afraid that he might have given some offence, he asked a friend who was staying with him to go round the parish and learn how the sermon had been regarded. To the astonishment of both, the villagers greatly approved the sermon, with the one exception that while the Rector had said nothing but what he ought to say, he did not himself practise what he preached. 'You don't say so,' said the cautious inquirer; 'what does the Rector do that is wrong?' 'Why, sir,' was the reply, 'you see, he told us we ought to give custom to whom custom was due, and yet he doesn't deal in the village, but buys his things at Newport.'

instituted, as well as an evening service with sermon on all Saint's days, and a daily service during Holy Week. It was only in September that he came into residence, but by the end of October he had begun a Sunday School; and by the beginning of November he had established a weekly cottage service at Brookside, followed up and accompanied by two others each week at Atherfield and Sutton,[2] all of them hamlets in the parish. Before Christmas he had commenced an evening preparation class for communicants at Brighstone, which succeeded so well that in February, 1831, he set on foot a similar one at Brookside for the people in that portion of the parish. And it should be added that during all the years that he was Rector of Brighstone these engagements and their fulfilment were noted in his diary as each week went by; and when, after a few years, he had the assistance of a curate, it is specified whether they were undertaken by himself or by his deputy. To this day the villagers remember how no weather stopped him; while, as to his preaching, a story is yet current how at evening service he would sometimes go on till it grew 'dark, so that you could not see him; but,' it is added, 'the people would have sat all night listening.'[3] He also established an allotment ground for the labourers, then quite a novelty in parochial arrangements.

For the first year or two there was little to draw him away from his parish, and everything to keep him there. But visits were exchanged between him and Dr. Wilson, Vicar of Holy Rood, Southampton, one of Bishop Sumner's most trusted friends; while visits to Brighstone are recorded from Mr. C. Simeon and Mr.

[2] Afterwards, 1833, similar cottage services were extended to Calbourne Bottom, another part of the parish.

[3] The narrator on whose authority this statement is made was a man of over thirty years of age when S. Wilberforce became Rector.

Sargent, from the Spooners, his mother's relations, and of course from his father, who was so much attached to the place that at one time he was on the point of buying a house there for himself; and to this day a long stretch of level ground halfway up the down to the north of the village is pointed out as 'old Mr. Wilberforce's walk.' Mr. Simeon and Mr. Sargent were visiting together at Brighstone in September 1831, and the following rather curious memorandum occurs respecting their conversation after service one Sunday evening:—

Sep. 29, 1831.—Simeon, contrasting this time with Whitfield's and Wesley's, spoke of the coldness now:—'Such men as Daniel Wilson, Marsh, &c., labouring, with but little or no fruit. There's a *do* [*dew*] everywhere but a shower nowhere.'

And then S. Wilberforce adds his own comment, shrewdly enough:—

Quære. (1) The truth of the statement? (2) If true, *does it not arise from a mistaken expectation of some effusion of the Holy Spirit different from* that vouchsafed by God in His ordinances to all who seek for it?

With the exception of some very short absences, and a holiday of about five weeks in the summer of 1831, Samuel Wilberforce scarcely ever left Brighstone during the first two years after his induction. The following letter, written within a few months of his setting to work there is a fair specimen of his correspondence at this period:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Mr. P. Boyle.

Brighstone, January 2, 1831.

My dear Boyle,—It is so very long since we have exchanged communications that I hardly know how to begin writing to you. And yet I have known you long enough to

be assured that you have not in the meantime altered either with your own changed situation or with the vicissitudes of things around you. Neither am I myself changed since I cast off the slough of Radicalism which ignorance chiefly had led me to wear, even as I did in patches. I have gradually advanced in Toryism, and now I think we should tolerably well agree together. What think you of the state of things? I am not one of those laughing-eyed people who see everything *en couleur de rose.* With an infidel press, an ungodly people, and a scorning Parliament which knows not, nor will hear, the voice of truth except as a matter of ridicule, I cannot see how we can expect anything but distress. If this were otherwise, as once it was, when as a people, represented by our King and Parliament, we professed at least to respect religion, I should have no fears; but as it is I do tremble for England. And when I look around with these feelings I see on every side the visible threatenings of Providence; a discontented people, one class pressing upon another, and all at war between themselves; an assaulted Church ill defended; poor-laws making all paupers in order to provide an inheritance for the idle and the profligate; a demi-Radical government with the true march-of-mind spirit; and the whole of Europe shaken to its base by the volcanic throes of revolution; while such spirits as Cobbett, Hume, W. Harvey & Co., seem, like insects before thunder, or seamews before a storm, instinctively to rejoice in the coming tempest. One's mind must, I think, at these times turn often to the commencement of the reign of our martyred sovereign, and it is quite a refreshment to the mind to let it pasture at will in his writings. Do you know the Εἰκὼν βασιλικὴ well? You are worthy of knowing it, because you are qualified to judge of its authenticity and to enjoy its beauty.

I am settled here in a very comfortable house and in a pleasant situation, about half a mile from the sea, under a fine range of chalk downs. We have had no disturbances in our neighbourhood, and scarcely any in our island, which by means of a consolidation of its parishes has the plague of poor-laws in only a mitigated form. We have had a few fires in the island; for the discovery of the incendiaries very large

sums, 700*l.* (*sic*), have been offered, but hitherto in vain. Our farmers have been very much upon the watch, one in particular staid up all night for a very long time, well armed with pistols, &c., in case of any assault upon his premises. What think you of French affairs? Do you see anything of poor Charles X.? I trust that Polignac, &c., will escape. It is quite horrible to think of his sentence. I suppose, though, that the Chamber of Peers were afraid of pronouncing any other. Certainly they did manage very ill. They laid their plans ill, and executed them feebly. The evil they have done us by spreading the democratical liberal spirit is very dreadful.

Write to me soon. Any information you can send me as to the fare of your peasantry, their earnings and advantages, I should be very glad to receive.

With reference to the vehement expressions of Toryism which occur either in this or in any other letters which may be quoted, it is necessary to bear in mind that 1831 was a time when for various reasons Radicalism was associated with such an amount of anti-clerical feeling that bishops could not appear in the streets without danger of personal violence. The sacking and burning of the Bishop of Bristol's palace was only the most signal example of a feeling which was not confined to that locality. The Bishop of London could not keep an engagement to preach at St. Ann's, Westminster, lest the congregation should either quit the church or else maltreat him. Later on, Bishop Ryder, of Lichfield, the father of Samuel Wilberforce's friend and brother-in-law, was grossly insulted and in actual danger of being killed after preaching at St. Bride's Church. Even Archbishop Howley, on coming to Canterbury for his primary visitation, was insulted, spat upon, and only brought with difficulty by a circuitous route to the Deanery, amid the execrations of a furious mob. On the fifth of November, in many of

the towns, and especially in the Cathedral towns, the Bishops were substituted for Guy Fawkes, and the Bishops of Exeter and Winchester were burnt in effigy close to their own palace gates.[4]

The following passage from a letter written during his first autumn at Brighstone will show that his island parish was not unvisited by alarms :—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Mr. C. Anderson.

Brixton [Brighstone], November 30, 1830.

My dear Charles,—Many thanks for your two last letters. The state of the country in the south is very distressing, and it is spreading into this island. Saturday we had a fire, and 200*l.* worth of hay was burnt down near Newport. To-day an insurrection of the labourers was expected, but I hope we have prevented it. Mr. A. is in a state of such alarm that I think the diet and exercise it is to him will certainly carry off a fit of the gout under which he has lately been suffering. He makes a point of coming up to me twice a day, full of the most woful news, and requesting me to swear in special constables, appoint patrols, &c., as if we were in an enemy's country. . . . Lord Malmesbury is come into the island, and altogether I have a great hope that things will not be half so bad as people expect. However, I fear that rent and tithe will be sunk. What do your labourers earn a week? Do they live now with the farmers or do they board themselves? What do they get when they are working for parish pay? and what additional allowance is made according to the number of their children?

He did not confine himself to writing letters to his friends, but before he had been many months in his living he published a penny tract on tithes. 'I have written,' he says to Mr. Charles Anderson, under

[4] See the Rev. W. Nassau Molesworth's *History of England from the Year* 1830, pp. 197–8, ed. 1874, who adds his own personal recollection of 'the fierce shout of applause which rent the air at a large public meeting at Canterbury when one of the speakers suggested that the noble Cathedral of that city should be converted into a stable for the horses of the cavalry.'

date February 25, 1831, 'a very short tract on tithes, to try and correct the prejudices of the lower orders of farmers,[5] &c. It is called "A Conversation on the Hardship and Injustice of Tithes," printed by Rivington. It is only *one penny*, so do order two or three shillings' worth at your bookseller's, and distribute them about you. I think of setting a boy to give them away some market day. Uncontradicted statements go for truths, and do inconceivable mischief.' With his mind and thoughts so entirely occupied with parochial and domestic matters, there is naturally little for the biographer to chronicle; but it should be mentioned that he was asked to preach the sermon on the occasion of the Bishop's visitation at Newport, August 25, 1831; and that he was already showing his interest in the missionary work of the Church, preaching 'two missionary sermons' at St. John's Chapel, Chichester, on Trinity Sunday, 1831, and also speaking at a missionary meeting on the following Monday. It is characteristic also to find that before he had been a year and a half in his parish he had compiled a hymn-book for its use; and that so soon as February 28, 1832, there occurs this entry in his diary—'Finished hymns, and wrote to the Bishop with them.' It was published in August 1832 (a *third* edition of 2,000 being called for by October 1833), during which month the Bishop of Winchester was again paying a few days' visit to the young Rector of Brighstone. And thus end the first two years of his incumbency.[6]

[5] The following passage from the diary is too illustrative of the customs of a now by-gone day to be omitted. It refers to his first tithe audit dinner.

'*Tuesday*, 18 *January* [1831]. Audit,—a good Audit Dinner: 23 people drank 11 bottles of wine, 28 quarts of beer, 2½ of spirits, and 12 bowls of punch; and would have drank twice as much if not restrained. None, we hope, drunk.'

But before another year precautions were taken against the repetition of such excess.

[6] One or two domestic items may be added. On January 8, 1831, his only

With the beginning of 1833 occurs the first visible and overt indication of that power of drawing people together which perhaps more than any other of his gifts distinguished the subject of this biography, and which, had his lot been cast in political instead of clerical life, must have contributed to render him at least as distinguished in the secular as he actually was in the ecclesiastical sphere. To him was owing the formation of a monthly meeting of clergy for discussion and consultation. On October 1, 1832, his friend, R. Hurrell Froude, had written to him :—

I hear you are the Dallas[7] of the day with our friend, *i.e.* that you stand in the shoes once occupied by that worthy. You will think all this very impertinent if you are become a Don. But I heard such a good character of you when I crossed from Southampton to Cowes about two months back, that I am induced to hope for the best. He said you were the *μέγας διαλλακτής* of the Island, and that if it was not for you all the parsons would be by the ears.

Accordingly, his diary for January 1, 1833, records the first meeting of the new association together with the subject appointed for its first discussions :—

Settled preliminaries and began the Ordination Service. A very pleasant meeting. May God make it the beginning of a profitable custom.

His correspondence during the latter months of 1832 and the early months of 1833 shows that he was also moving strenuously in the direction of a union

surviving sister, Elizabeth, was married to the Rev. J. James. On February 10, 1832, she died at Ryde, and was buried in Brighstone churchyard.

On June 16, 1832, his brother Robert was married to Agnes, daughter of Archdeacon Wrangham, having been previously preferred to the Rectory of East Farleigh by Lord Brougham, then Lord Chancellor.

[7] The Rev. A. R. C. Dallas, from 1828 to 1870 Rector of Wonston, and Chaplain to Bishop Sumner of Winchester.

between the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society. No letters of Samuel Wilberforce's on the subject have been preserved, but the numbers of replies from such men as Mr. C. Bridges, Mr. (afterwards Archdeacon) Hoare, and Mr. Hugh James Rose, show how energetically he was endeavouring to push his scheme, though unhappily without success. Meantime he was making his first ventures as a writer. On February 1, 1833, he wrote to his brother, 'I should like to be in alliance with some Review, as a means of making me read and write.' Soon after, he became a frequent contributor to the 'British Magazine,' of which Mr. Hugh James Rose was the editor:—

I shall be most thankful—writes Mr. Rose on February 11—for your paper on Laud, one to whom not only has justice not been done, but to whom cruel injustice has been done. . . . Many thanks for your kindness about the Magazine, my motive for undertaking which was to open a channel for free and friendly communication amongst the clergy.

At this time, too, he published a pamphlet in defence of the Church Missionary Society; and during the winter of 1832–3 he put together a little volume of stories, called 'The Note-Book of a Country Clergyman,'[8] intended, as he writes to his brother, to be 'illustrative as far as possible of the sort of influence a resident clergyman has,' and of which part at least was the actual record of cases which occurred in his own parish. The book was published without his name, but the MS. so approved itself to his publishers that they gave him a hundred guineas for the copyright. The spring of 1833 found him spending a week, March 20–26, with his Bishop and Mrs. Sumner at Win-

[8] Published in 1833 by Seeley and Burnside.

chester House, St. James's Square, the first of a long series of such visits.

Wednesday, March 20.—London by 4 and ¼ P.M. To Hatchard's, &c. Bishop and Mrs. S. *very* kind. Evening alone with them, very pleasant. He told me all about Binstead. Not for ——.

Thursday, 21.—Mor^{g} prayers at ¼ past 8. Breakfast, Sir T. Acland, full of spirits, talk, compliment, and Bude Church. Tom Acland full of books, anti-Rose, Newman, &c., Jebb's Burnet, &c. Mathison to dinner, large party. To H. of Commons, heard A. Baring, M. Attwood, Warburton, Pease, O'Connell, A. Johnson, &c. &c. Saw Buxton, A. Verney, Lord Barham, F. Baring, &c. Simeon came and told me the names, &c. &c. Home late.

Friday, 22.—In the morning walked up with J. Money to see the Bishop's picture. Back to Winchester House. Found Seeley waiting. Wanted my name to MSS. Refused. Offered to publish and go shares as to first edition, and then to buy, or 50 guineas for every 1,000 copies, or 100 guineas out and out. Agreed to the last, and I am to have 50 copies. Party to dinner, Osborne, Mathison, Lowthers, Deverill, &c.

Saturday, 23.—Mor^{g} read H. S., then some Dugald Stewart, Mad^{e} de Maintenon, &c. Went to Clapham to dinner at the Bp. of Chester's. Four bishops, Winton, Bristol, Lichfield, Chester:—Knowles, 2 Hen. Thorntons, Mr. and Emily Ryder.

Sunday, 24.—To Percy Chapel to hear Mr. Melvill. Powerful man—noisy—great danger of extravagance. Sermon, 'Thou through thy commandments hast made me wiser than mine enemies.' Subj^{t}, That the study of H. S. is a greater means of intellectual improvement than any other study. Afternoon to S. James'. Heard the Bp. of London. Good sermon, very: 'Flee youthful lusts.' He was affected to tears.

Monday, 25.—Dinner. Melvill, McCaul, Dealtry, Hough, Burrows, Snow, Dollman, &c. &c. Spoke to Dr. D. concerning reviewing Thomason, &c. At night Mrs. Sumner and the

Bishop most kind. He begged me (and she also) never to go elsewhere when in London.

During this year, 1833, S. Wilberforce lost both his father-in-law, Mr. Sargent, at the comparatively early age of 52; and also his father, full of years, full likewise of honour from all good men, at the age of 73. The details of the public funeral, and the interment in Westminster Abbey, are known to all, so that there is no need to dwell upon them here.[9] The last mention of Mr. C. Simeon occurs in connection with these two events; first, as joining the Sargent family at Mr. Sargent's funeral at Lavington, and next as visiting Samuel Wilberforce at Brighstone after his father's death, and as preaching on the subject. Later on in the year, the Bishop of Winchester was again a guest for two or three days at Brighstone Rectory; when Samuel Wilberforce preached the sermon at the Bishop's Visitation, October 23, at Newport, and was desired by the Bishop to publish it. It is somewhat curious to observe that this sermon, which met with the most flattering approval from the Bishop of Winchester, did not escape the criticism of one at least of the preacher's friends—namely, Mr. Gerard Noel, who wrote very anxiously both to the Bishop and to Mr. S. Wilberforce in reference to what he considered its 'High Church principles,' and warning the latter against the 'serious calamity of entertaining extreme opinions.' And an amusing paragraph occurs in a letter from Samuel Wilberforce to a friend, written

[9] An incident characteristic of the times is, however, written by another hand across part of a letter of Samuel Wilberforce's describing the funeral:—

'I remember that at this funeral I was in Lord Calthorpe's carriage. There was about this time a strong feeling about Bishops, and as we got out at the Abbey door I heard one of the low fellows standing about, in reply to another who appeared very surly and inclined to be disrespectful, say—"No! It's not a Tulip," meaning that there was no mitre on the panel.'

a few days after from Sir Henry Thompson's, at Bembridge, at whose house the Bishop and Mr. S. Wilberforce were staying :—

> We spent a very pleasant evening and morning with Sir H. Thompson, and I had a discussion about the Divine Right of Episcopacy, into which he amicably compelled me at breakfast. He told me afterwards he discussed it because 'he thought I was bolstering up the Bishop into High Church notions on the subject, and he was determined he should know that there were persons who thought differently.'

The sermon was published under the title of 'The Apostolical Ministry,'[1] and was both striking and outspoken. It called upon the clergy to 'prize at a higher rate that unbroken succession whereby those who ordained us are joined unto Christ's own Apostles.' It spoke strongly on 'the danger of quitting the high vantage ground of Apostolical authority to fight the battle out upon the doubtful level of Erastian principles;' in a foot-note, the writer added, 'for a monstrous specimen of such latitudinarian Erastianism, see the speculations of Dr. Arnold;' and he spoke of King Charles I. as he 'whom we fear not to call a martyr.'

During this autumn he was applied to from many quarters—among others by Chancellor Raikes, of Chester, by Mr. C. Simeon, and by Mr. Lyte,—to publish some memoir of his father-in-law, which he did by prefixing a sketch of his life to his publication, in 1837, of the Letters and Journals of Henry Martyn. Of local and parochial incidents the year adds little to what has been previously related; and indeed the following quotation from a letter of September 12, 1833, is almost the only indication of any special undertaking :

[1] Its full title was '*The Apostolical Ministry: its Difficulties, Strength, and Duties.* A Sermon preached at the Visitation of Charles Richard, Lord Bishop of Winchester, and published at the request of the Lord Bishop and Clergy of the Deanery.' Seeley and Sons, 1833.

We have been busy setting up Church Missionary Associations hereabouts with much prospect of usefulness. It is my favourite society, so thoroughly Church of England, so eminently active and spiritual, so important for a maritime nation whose commerce has led her to carry the Devil's missionaries everywhere.

Meanwhile the diary shows that his old friendships continued in full force; visits are recorded from Sir G. Prevost, F. Oakeley, R. H. Froude, G. D. Ryder, and now also first occurs the name of H. E. Manning, whom, a little later on, November 7, he married, in Lavington Church, to his sister-in-law, Caroline Sargent. Evident tokens also occur of his beginning to be sought for as a preacher outside of his own parish; and this year's diary records him as preaching more than once at Southampton for Dr. Wilson, as well as at Cowes, at Ryde, at Newport, and elsewhere; and in November he spent some days at Farnham Castle, on a visit to the Bishop. He was clearly beginning to be observed as a rising man.

Early in 1834 he was asked to undertake the charge of the Old Chapel, familiar to almost every one, near to the Parade at Tunbridge Wells, a matter which was fully discussed towards the end of the following letter to his brother:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Brighstone Rectory, Jan. 29, 1834.

My dearest Robert,—I have been intending to write every evening, but something has prevented me. I do not know how it is, I do little, I think little, I read little. Yet my time slips away as if there were great vested results from it. I have not had time yet to read above ½ of Newman,[2] although

[2] This refers to *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, published in 1833, by Mr. J. H. Newman.

when I get it into my hand I can scarcely lay it down again. I think it a glorious book. I have never read any except the 'Christian Year' and Bishop Butler which gave me so much purely intellectual gratification. But I still think, just as I did of old, that the style is sometimes obscure, and often awkward. Moreover, I think the remarks on preaching likely to be *very* injurious, the doctrine of the *οἰκονομία* put forth unguardedly, the *disciplina arcani* carried back beyond what any of his authorities warrant, the quotation from Cor[3] entirely misrepresented, and a dangerous spirit often visible, something of harshness (like the insinuation about the ——'s charges of ignorance of Scripture), and a lowering view of doctrine, connected with, and in him justified by, high poetical feelings and holy habits, all of which I think make it very dangerous.

But I must turn to another point. I will undertake any part of the work[3] you like and think you can separate for me. I will, if you think it expedient, give myself to the Anti-slavery question. I think that I had better come and see you and talk matters over with you. I should drive up to London necessarily. This will take *two* or *three* days. I must have at least one day in town, and I must be 3 days coming home, and get home by Saturday the 15th. I should very much like to be in London Monday the 10th at one o'clock at the Christian Knowledge Society's meeting about the Bible Soc. Committee.

(*Very private.*)—I had yesterday an offer from Rowland to secure my appointment to the Tunbridge Wells Chapel if I would take it, 350*l.* per annum. What say you? Blunt of Chelsea is in the field, but there are strong prejudices against him, none, he says, against me, but *au contraire*, from their acquaintance with me. I have written to say that I should much prefer B.'s appointment, but that if he was ineligible, and the place likely to fall into bad hands, and they would be contented with 6 months' residence, and my Bishop approved, I would think of it. Moreover I gave a high character of Blunt, for him to read as my view, as he thought that would be eminently useful to him, some having declared to

[3] The biography of his father.

Rowland that if B. agreed with me they would support him. So the matter rests. . . . Believe me to be ever your most affᵉ brother,

SAML. W.

The Bishop of Winchester was of course referred to, but strongly disapproved of the plan, and wrote :—

I have no hesitation in saying that it seems to me to hold out no one inducement for you. You will scarcely choose to descend from the parish priest to the pulpit preacher; and in my judgment the two situations are not tenable simultaneously. Has it occurred to you that it might be suitable to your brother Henry? Turn this in your mind, and if I can be of use in the matter, as regards Ordination, the Bishop of the diocese consenting, I will not be wanting. Very affectʸ your's,

C. WINTON.

The proposal was consequently declined, but within four months after he received, on May 5, through Mr. C. Simeon, a very different offer, and one which gave him ground for much more careful consideration and consultation. This time it was no mere chapel in a country watering-place that was proposed to him, but the important London Rectory of St. Dunstan's; and the following letters, the former to his brother Robert, while the matter was still pending, the latter to Mr. Boyle, after his decision had been arrived at, give a sufficient account of the matter, and mention likewise the beginning of his father's biography, which was to engross so much of his time and labour during the next four years :—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Brighstone Rectory, May 23, 1834.

My dearest Robert,—I am still in doubt. The Bp. of London has written once and insists upon *the city.* I have pointed out the Act, which says in the city, parish, *or place,* where the living is situate. He is going to get Dr. Lushing-

ton's opinion upon this point, whether it would be residence within the meaning of the Act, or require a licence, anywhere within two miles of Temple Bar. As to ambitious feelings, I trust I should not act from them. I cannot at all think with you worldly policy clear either way. Looking at it so, I should say it was a lottery in which I staked certain comfort against the chance of rising to an uncomfortable eminence. But I earnestly desire and pray *constantly* to be able to put these thoughts altogether aside. If the parish *did* build a house, and after a year or two in London Emily could live in the city, there would be no question about income. Indeed, Henry Hoare, to whom I have written, gives it in detail as 700*l.* a year now, and every probability of its being 800*l.* if the Rector were popular. This would make me able to live. My Bishop is evidently against my moving. Mr. Raikes advises my staying, on the ground of a present post of great usefulness, and that I shall be called *clearly* to a more important one when I am ready. Mr. Blunt and Dealtry only hesitate as to income. The Bp. of Chester says he thinks I shall not be wrong in staying here anyhow. At present I wait for Dr. Lushington's opinion. If that binds me to the city the question is settled. Do write again and give me fully your thoughts. I do not think there is the *smallest probability* of the Bp. of Winton giving me a stall at St. Dunstan's. Then ought I to risk income with my family? Do write to me, and believe me to be, in the meantime, your most affect^e^ brother,

SAM^L^ WILBERFORCE.

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Mr. P. Boyle.

Farnham Castle, June 30, 1834.

My dear Boyle,—. . . The last year has been indeed a year marked by the greatest losses to both of us—I mean my wife and myself—losses which we must feel ever most deeply. I have drawn up a short sketch of the character of Mr. Sargent, which may appear before long in print, and my brother Robert and I are both engaged upon my father's life. We hope to have it ready by next spring.[4]

[4] The Life did not actually appear until 1838.

I have been much importuned to leave my situation in the Isle of Wight and take a large and important living in London, St. Dunstan's in the West. The income of St. D.'s is larger a good deal than that of Brighstone; but, with the deductions of house-rent and London expenses, I should have been a poorer man there than in the country. The question, however, did not turn upon money. Health and usefulness were my questions; and the necessity of taking my family to reside in the city, with other considerations, had made it clear to me that my duty is to remain where I am. I rejoice upon the whole in being able to come to this decision; for though London has many attractions, especially of an intellectual nature, yet undoubtedly a country parsonage is a happier post upon the whole.

We have just been holding a meeting of the friends of the Church at Newport. It is, as you know, a stronghold of Radicals, Socinians, and Dissenters of every sort. The Dissenters mustered very strong by having had a previous meeting, at which they determined to come and put us down. They sent for their two members, Hawkins and Ord, who tried every means of defeating us, speaking, amendments, noise, &c. &c. I quite agree with you in thinking the prospect of things very bad, and yet I think better than of old. I have no doubt that a new election would give us a Parliament of Tories and Radicals, and that the Whigs would be nearly extinguished as a party. However, I am less and less of a politician: I am a strong Churchman, and if a man is only a Churchman I can forgive him anything else in the world. We are staying here for two or three days. We go back to the Isle of W. very soon. Our kindest remembrances. Ever, my dear Boyle, your's very affect^y^,

SAM. WILBERFORCE.

A letter to Mr. Charles Anderson gives a few more details of this period:—

Lavington, July 3, 1834.

My dear Charles,—We left the Isle of Wight about a month ago for this place that I might officiate at the marriage of my wife's youngest sister and G. Ryder. Thence we

went to Richmond, and thence we went to our Bishop's house in St. James' Square for ten or twelve days, and came on here on the 23rd. I left Emily here and went on myself to the Isle of Wight, in order to be present at a great meeting of the friends of the Church upon the Wednesday. The Dissenters had held a meeting in the Socinian Chapel to settle whether they should attempt to oppose us, and they agreed to attend *en masse* in order to interrupt the proceedings. The meeting was summoned thus: 'The friends of the Church to agree to an address or petition for maintaining the Church, as now by law established;'—they had, therefore, no sort of right to attend. They came, however, in great force; they sent to London for their two Radical members, who came down on purpose and moved amendments to our resolutions. They tried noise and disturbance of every kind; but in spite of all their efforts we completely defeated them. We had all the gentry and a great number of the yeomanry present. I spoke for an hour; and never spoke with so much comfort to myself or effect upon others before. . . .

I do not know exactly what tract to recommend you on this subject. I wish for yourself that you would try and read the Oxford Tracts; Rivingtons sell them—'Tracts for the Times'—and if you will order them through your bookseller the whole expense will only be between two and three shillings. There is one of them named 'Richard Nelson,' in two parts, by *Thomas* Keble, which will, I think, answer your purpose.

I am just returned from Farnham Castle, having been to preach a Ch. Miss[y] sermon at Farnham. Did I mention St. Dunstan's to you in my last letter? Mr. Simeon has earnestly pressed upon me the living. It is worth about 700*l.* a year, and it is a very important place. I refused it on the ground that my income was not large enough to hire a house and keep a curate; and that the *city*, in which the Bp. of London said that I *must* reside, would not do for my wife and children. Mr. Simeon has been to London and writes now, having seen the Bp., to ask whether I will take it, he providing a house for the living in Lincoln's Inn Fields. Now this is to me a most painful rip-up of a well-settled question. I cannot see

exactly what is right to do, and that is a most painful state of uncertainty. It is only this day that the question has re-opened upon me. . . . Write very soon. Ever your's very affy,

SAM. WILBERFORCE.

The following extract from a letter to his wife's and his own intimate friend, Miss Louisa Noel,[5] written on returning to his parish after a short absence at Farnham Castle, gives some account of the feelings with which he felt his pastoral responsibilities :—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Miss Louisa Noel.

Brighstone Rectory, Nov. 5, 1834.

My dearest Sister,—You shall not be disappointed because your brother has written *nothing* to you ; although he can only write out, *nothing*, in letters and words to-night. We both want you here very much,—*here in quiet.* Yes, though you say I am not fitted for the *quiet* of domestic life, but require external excitement. I *never* come home to my parish without a saddened spirit, saddened with myself and with the state of things around me. The *prospect* of work and exertion promises more than the reality performs, and the new forms of sin and of suffering which have accumulated in a few weeks' absence come with a force which the *daily* load possesses at no one time.

From this date his thoughts, time, and correspondence became largely occupied with the biography of his father, which he and his elder brother Robert undertook in combination. Of course a joint work like this necessitated almost incessant communication, alike personal and epistolary ; and the close correspondence which began during the years occupied in compiling the biography, was kept up afterwards with, if possible, greater regularity during nearly the whole of the elder brother's life. It is mainly owing to this correspon-

[5] See *post*, page 94.

dence that such ample evidence is producible of the deep personal affection which Samuel Wilberforce felt for his most able and accomplished b other: an affection which was certainly one of the strongest feelings of his whole life, and which, as will be seen hereafter, rendered that brother's secession to Rome one of the severest, if not actually the severest, blow he ever experienced. These letters grow in interest as time advances, and many of them will have to be largely quoted in the sequel. A hasty letter of the close of the year 1834 marks the beginning of a series which extends over the next twenty years:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Brighstone, Dec. 19, 1834.

My dearest Robert,—I received your kind letter on Wednesday as I went to our clerical meeting at Arreton and read it through at night. I am very sorry that —— should ever pain you by not seeing those little points; but I am comforted by thinking that y^r^ patient way of receiving those particular additions to your own trial must be producing its own good effect upon y^r^ character; and—(Dec. 25) So far I wrote on the day bearing the above date, and intended to have finished, but accounts and other hindrances have multiplied upon me with such self-multiplying power that I am only now going on with it, at near 12 o'clock at night, after 2 full services and a sacrament. I have thought much of you, my dearest brother, and called to mind my last participation of that sacred ordinance with you at Farleigh. You have no doubt been receiving it also. May you be continually strengthened by it. I like very much your proposal about writing, and will endeavour to answer you regularly. If I write Wednesday, you will receive it Saturday; and this I will endeavour to do. I long to keep up a close and intimate communication with you. I have not read much more of the 'Faery Queen,' but I have read several small things of Spenser's, and found one or two of most exceeding beauty. One, which I cannot refer to

now, is to me perfect in point of rhythm and cadence as well as conception. I shall like to read it with you when you come to us.

I have had a very pressing invitation from Scholefield to come to Cambridge and preach the Missionary Sermons in his church next March. I have not yet answered, but am disposed to decline as being out of my beat; give me your judgment in your next, as I must answer speedily. (*Private.*) —I have had a very kind letter from Sir R. Simeon, saying it is his first application, &c., and begging me to let him know what line I mean to take as to his election, &c., telling me he is to be opposed. I have answered that I must depend on his tone, that if he will shake off the Radicals I and all else will support him; but that otherwise under present circumstances I fear I shall be obliged to oppose him. Send me your judgment on what had better be my line here. . . . I have a very kind and characteristic letter from James Stephen criticising Newman's Sermons very justly. . . . Ever most affectionately, though much tired, your brother,

SAML. WILBERFORCE.

This reference to Sir R. Simeon's candidateship for a seat in Parliament, his anxiety to secure the support of a popular and already somewhat leading clergyman, and the prominence given to Church questions, may call for a few words of remark. It was at the close of the year 1834, scarcely two years and a half after the passing of the first Reform Bill, and while the country was still heaving with the excitement, amidst which, and by the aid of which, that celebrated measure became law. It was the time of the general election, consequent upon the dissolution of the short-lived but most energetic Parliament, which had been elected in the winter following the Reform Bill. It was the Parliament which had reduced the number of the Irish Bishops from twenty-two to twelve, and that of the Irish Archbishops from

four to two. It was the Parliament under which the Irish Church Commission was appointed, under which the existence of the Irish Church Establishment had been seriously threatened, to say nothing of that of England; and during whose continuance, however popular and useful many of its measures, the beginnings were already felt of that Conservative reaction of which Sir Robert Peel was afterwards the leader. The circumstances, too, of the dissolution, and of the consequent elections, were not without something of the dramatic element. The King, whose tendencies at his accession had been decidedly 'liberal,' was known to be already weary of his Ministers and of their course; and on May 28, 1834, he had availed himself of the occasion of an Address from the Irish Bishops and Clergy to deliver, not a written, but an extempore reply, in terms so entirely sympathetic, and so generally hostile to the Ministerial policy, that henceforward there could be no doubt as to his feelings. At last, on November 14, the King found or made an excuse for dismissing Lord Melbourne's Ministry, and the Duke of Wellington counselled his sending for Sir Robert Peel; but that statesman was then in Rome, where he had intended to winter, so that the singular spectacle was presented of a Ministry having to wait three whole weeks for its head, until, on December 9, Sir Robert could arrive in London. Of course, it was impossible for a Conservative Ministry to carry on the Government with a Parliament elected in the height of the Reform fever; the dissolution, which actually took place on December 30, was foreseen at once, and without a moment's delay the whole force of the Conservative party was concentrated upon a desperate but premature effort to secure a Parliamentary majority.

Sir R. Simeon's letter to Mr. S. Wilberforce is still

extant, and it urges with no small skill every conceivable ground upon which a clergyman in his position could give his support to a Liberal candidate. As usual, he referred the letter and the question in general to his Bishop, whose vigorous and decisive reply may not unreasonably be given :—

The Bishop of Winchester to Rev. S. Wilberforce.

Farnham Castle, Dec. 25, 1834.

My dear Wilberforce,—I have lately been placed in the same position by Sir G. Staunton in which you now find yourself with respect to Sir R. Simeon. The former wrote to me that reports were abroad reflecting on him as unfriendly to the Church, appealing to my knowledge of his good feelings, and asking for a character with leave to show it. I wrote, in reply, a private letter, acquainting him that, notwithstanding his many acts of liberality towards the Church in his own neighbourhood, &c., his vote in the last Session, on the admission of Dissenters to the University and on the Irish Tithe Bill, satisfied me that we differed essentially as to our views of service and disservice to the Church, and that were I an elector I could not give a vote in the present crisis to one who, by canvassing in connection with a member of the late Cabinet, identified himself with measures, in my judgment, inconsistent with the welfare of the Church. I have stated all this because, if I were in your place, I should act in a similar spirit towards Sir R. Simeon. What *were* his votes? What *are* his intentions? Unless these questions could be answered satisfactorily to my mind, I could not vote for him, whatever was my private regard, unless it were to save the island from a destructive of a still lower grade. Of course you will consider all this as private. . . .

Kindest love to Mrs. Wilberforce, and a kiss to Arnie and baby. Ever y^r^ most affect^e^

C. WINTON.

Mr. S. Wilberforce declining to support the Liberal candidate, his active support was at once sought for by

the Conservatives, and he was asked to second Mr. Ward's nomination, a proposal to which his Bishop gave an equally uncompromising opposition :—

I think there is not sufficient ground for warranting you to take the very objectionable step, either of seconding Mr. Ward's nomination on the hustings, or of speaking at all there. I think you will seem, and be, out of place.

Accordingly, while taking the utmost interest in the contest, he declined the position offered him; but no one will be surprised to find that, however little he may have intended it, still the occasion did not pass by without at least a short speech from his eager and already eloquent lips. The incident was a striking one, and his own letter recording it is not less so :—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Brighstone Rectory, Jan. 12, 1835.

My dearest Robert,—. . . The truth is, that I have been a good deal hurried by the necessity of going to Newport several times last week on election business. All to-day I have been there, upon the hustings the greater part of the day. I was asked to second Mr. Ward's nomination for the county. He comes forward, you know, upon the strictly Conservative side. This, however, I declined, thinking it was not the post for a parson. For the same reason I declined to speak there, though I think that I might have done some service. However, this afternoon, after the nomination, when Mr. Ward's friends mustered in the Bugle Inn, about 100 strong, after drinking 'The Church,' there was a call for me, and I got up thinking it was a good opportunity, as the room was full of substantial yeomen, both of explaining why all the clergy were with Ward, and of striking while the iron of political excitement was hot, and leaving an impression of Churchmanship hereafter. I spoke to this effect for some 10 minutes in the midst of amazing cheers, and then they drank 'The Church and Mr. Wilberforce,' &c. I do not expect to

carry Ward's election this time, but I think Simeon will never sit again.

I hope that all this narration, my dearest Robert, is not uninteresting or irksome to you, though I can well understand the general apathy of your mind to this subject at present.[6] It cannot, I think, be called morbid feeling. It would only be morbid if you expected others to feel in the same way. We must undoubtedly 'leave God to govern His own world,' but we must remember that He governs by instruments, and we must not through indolence, I think, let slip any opportunity of promoting the success of His cause. And if, as it seems, there is a spirit of discontent and mad restlessness poured out upon the land, which is to work our overthrow as a nation, the only way to have tolerable peace is to be conscious of having, in our station, honestly withstood it.

As I stood to-day upon the high hustings of our Town Hall, lost for a moment to what was going on, I could not help forcibly realising the littleness and vanity of earthly things in the sight of superior intelligences. The shouts, and passions, and little interests, and furious desires of the brutal mob, and the calm, quiet guiding of Omnipotence making their crime their punishment. All my working plans[7] have been a good deal interrupted lately, but I hope to begin in earnest now at once. Good-bye, my dearest Robert. I am always your most affectionate brother,

SAML. WILBERFORCE.

It was almost immediately after this that he was, to use his own words, 'brought very near to the grave' by a severe inflammation of the lungs—an occasion which served to bring out still more emphatically the strong feelings of regard with which he had inspired his diocesan. The singularly affectionate terms of the intercourse between Bishop Sumner and Samuel Wilberforce are so marked that any biography which

[6] Mr. R. I. Wilberforce had lost his wife in the November previous to this letter.

[7] *i.e.* with reference to his father's biography.

should pass it over would be unjust to both of them. No apology is therefore necessary for giving the following letter, which was written as soon as Mr. S. Wilberforce was once more permitted to see his letters :—

The Bishop of Winchester to Rev. S. Wilberforce.

Farnham Castle, Feb. 16, 1835.

My dear Wilberforce,—With most unfeigned thankfulness do I avail myself of permission to address you again. You were little absent from our thoughts, waking or sleeping, during the days of your danger, and our present joyfulness is in proportion to the anxiety and emotion with which we watched for the post for that long and painful week. But we still rejoice with trembling ; and in proof of it I have abstained from writing some days since the receipt of Mrs. Sargent's kind letter. My own experience has taught me that there are few things more trying to a weakened frame than hearing again the language of affection from those we love. . . . I say nothing yet of your future care of yourself, because of course you will not think of doing anything at present. When the time comes I have a long chapter for you. At present you are *inhibited.* Ever, my dear Wilberforce, most affectionately your's,

C. WINTON.

How watchful the Bishop was over his young friend's welfare will be seen from the following extract from a hurried note written towards the end of the previous year (1834) :—

I avail myself of this cover to add one word respecting yourself. I am not yet quite satisfied with your prudence in self-management. You seemed to me not well during dinner on Thursday, and I have at other times seen symptoms cross your face which lead me to doubt whether you are not less careful than duty and *permanent usefulness* demand. I think you should be more quiet, less at the command of everybody who wants to be helped, should promise to go to fewer places

(always excepting Lavington and Farnham), in a word, that you should 'over-drive' yourself as little as you would your horses. Forgive a caution prompted by much affection, and act upon it for the sake of those who are still dearer.

As it is now known that the families of Wilberforce and Sumner were connected, it is the more desirable to observe that, however warm were the feelings of both the brothers Sumner, Bishops respectively of Chester and of Winchester, towards Mr. Wilberforce—of which the letters given above (pages 41 and 43) furnish examples—still the fact of a *family* connection was unknown to Bishop R. C. Sumner until between two and three years later than the date now in question, as the following letter shows :—

St. James' Square, May 13, 1837.

My dear Wilberforce,—I have just found out for the first time that we are first-cousins once removed, whereof I had no idea. See the enclosed paper, which I am desired to forward.

May 22.—We shall be happy to see you here as soon as you please after Thursday, June 1st. Most affect^y^ your's,

C. W.

No enclosed paper is to be found accompanying this letter, but the facts are as follow:[8] Hannah Bird and Mr. William Wilberforce, Samuel Wilberforce's father, were first-cousins. Hannah Bird married the Rev. Robert Sumner, Vicar of Kenilworth and Stoneleigh, and was the mother of J. Bird Sumner, Archbishop of Canterbury, and R. C. Sumner, Bishop of Winchester. Their father was 'a quiet, earnest, country clergyman of small means,'[9] who died in 1802, when J. B. Sumner was twenty-two, and R. C. Sumner was

[8] See *Life of R. C. Sumner, D.D., Bishop of Winchester*, by the Rev. G. Sumner, M.A. (Murray, 1876), pages 1, 2.

[9] *Life of Bishop R. C. Sumner*, as above, page 2.

twelve years of age, leaving also two other sons of the ages of ten and twenty-one years respectively.

Happily Samuel Wilberforce's illness passed rapidly away, and from this time up to Easter he was closely occupied in the preparation of Henry Martyn's Letters and Journals for the press. On Good Friday the following entry occurs in his diary :—

Friday, 17.—Good Friday. Up a little before 8. Read alone. Looked in at the school; performed morning service. A large congregation. Afternoon read 3 of Newman's sermons, &c. &c. Read Pusey's tractate on fasting—am convinced by it, if not of the duty, yet certainly of the expediency of conforming to the rules of the Church on this point. I think it likely to be especially useful to me in 3 ways: first, in enabling me to *realise* unseen things; one of my especial difficulties.

2. As likely to help me in prayer, in which I am greatly interrupted by an unbridled indolence.

3. In helping me to subdue the body to the spirit, which I think very needful for me.

I have also been brought to this conclusion both by seeing in my dearest father's journals his difficulties on this very point, when he set himself to serve GOD in earnest, and comparing it with the mortified and unselfindulgent life he led afterwards; and also by Mr. Martyn's experience recorded in his journals on the same point. I have, therefore, determined with God's help to make a conscience of observing the fasts of the Church. I set myself no exact limits of abstinence, intending only to practise on those days with a view to self-conquest and humiliation such self-denial, especially in meats and drinks and the like, as I can do *secretly* and without injury to my health or present exertion. Help me, Lord, to act wisely and humbly in this matter, and as in Thy sight.

On Easter-day his diary records 74 communicants, and from that time until the end of May, Henry Martyn's Journals continued to engross his attention. After this, until the middle of July, he was chiefly in London,

part of the time with Mrs. Wilberforce at Winchester House, sight-seeing—'we have seen British Institution, water-colours, Jerusalem panorama, piping bulfinches, &c.,' as he writes to Mr. C. Anderson—but chiefly busied during the week at the British Museum and elsewhere in preparations for the Life of his father, and on Sundays in hearing and making notes of the leading preachers of the day. Thus he records hearing Mr. Blunt at Chelsea, Mr. Snow at St. Dunstan's, Bishop Blomfield at St. James's, Dr. Benson at the Temple, the Bishop of Gloucester at Westminster Abbey, Mr. Sanderson Robins, Mr. Baptist Noel, Mr. Dale, Mr. Melvill—'a very striking sermon indeed'—together with a very popular preacher, who must remain nameless, whom he condemns for 'vile arrogance and low dogmatism,' while giving him credit for 'a good deal of earnestness and plain sense.' He also mentions having preached for Mr. Blunt at Chelsea, and for Mr. Snow at St. Dunstan's, but nowhere else, and then, after a few days at Farnham Castle, and at Lavington, he returned to Brighstone for the summer.

It was a busy summer with him, busy with visitors, and busy with work. His brother Robert was staying with him and they were working hard together at their father's biography. Besides this, his house seems to have been always filled with visitors, coming and going, while frequent sermons at a distance, chiefly for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society, are recorded in his diary.[1]

[1] It should be mentioned here that he was now assisted by a curate, Mr. Ramsay. On January 26, 1835, he had written to his brother Robert, 'I want to consult you about the expediency of my engaging a curate for six months or so. I find so very little time for my work that I can hardly do anything. Now if I had a curate, who would visit the sick and the schools, and take some of my lectures, I should be much more able to work as I wish at the slavery question. How long do you propose to stay with me? Because this may make

Among the guests occur the names of Mr. T. Acland, of H. E. Manning, of Mr. (now Dean) Bramston, of Mr. Lyte, of the Bishop of Winchester and Mrs. Sumner, of Mr. (now Archdeacon) Jacob, and many more. Mr. R. C. (now Archbishop) Trench's name is first mentioned at this time, in connection with the consecration of his church at Curdridge, on which occasion Mr. S. Wilberforce was present. So the summer passed away, and then in the autumn, from the early part of October until the beginning of December, Mr. and Mrs. S. Wilberforce were from home on a long and carefully recorded series of visits. The circuit began with four days at Farnham Castle, after which they were the guests of Dr. Macbride, at Oxford. Then they spent a week at Eccleshall, with Bishop Ryder, of Lichfield, where they met Bishop Gray, of Bristol, father of Bishop Wilberforce's subsequent friend, Bishop Gray of Capetown. After this they went to Hanbury, where his brother-in-law, G. D. Ryder, was Rector. Then to Elmdon, staying with Archdeacon Spooner, his relative on his mother's side, whence he took occasion to attend a vast meeting on Church matters at Birmingham; then to Leamington, at Mrs. Way's, then to Oxford again, including a visit to Checkendon; then for three days more to Farnham Castle; and, finally, after a week spent at Lavington, home to Brighstone. It is by no means trivial to observe and to chronicle the way in which, or the friends with whom, a man spends a time of rest and leisure; and the above brief notice is therefore not without its value. Some characteristic letters belong to this period, of which the following must suffice as specimens:—

some difference. Of course under ordinary circumstances I could not afford to keep a curate; but the 50*l.* or so it would cost me I think that I might fairly deduct from the profits of the work before any other division is made.'

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Hanbury, Nov. 10, 1835.

My dearest Robert,— . . . I have passed a very pleasant week here with G. D. Ryder. He is a very good fellow. I have not heard him preach. He has read me one of his sermons, which is very sensible, but too much 'whole-duty-of-man-ish,' I think. I fear that Newman makes such preachers contented out of all mind—who have less internal heat and volcanic heat than is always boiling in his own mind. By the way, Newman is just publishing a 3rd volume of sermons. I spent a day very pleasantly at Oxford. Newman was very kind indeed—stayed at our inn till 11 o'clock with us. I dined in common room, where the sights and sounds were curious: the cantankerous conceit of ——'s pettishness; the vulgar priggishness of ——'s jokes; the loud ungentlemanliness of ——'s cutlip arguments; the disinterred liveliness of ——, and the silence of Newman, were all *surprenant*, nay *épouvantable*. We stay at Archdeacon Spooner's until Friday; we then propose spending one night at Leamington (Mrs. Way's), and another at Campden, to go on Monday for one day or two to Oxford (Dr. Macbride has invited us), do. to Ipsden, one at Taplow, 2 at Cadogan Place, do. at Farnham, do. at Lavington, and home. . . . I fear that we cannot come to see you this time, because I must be getting home. I shall be hard at work all day directly I get there; you will perhaps come to us to work up, and knock off, some time in the spring.

My dearest brother, I have thought very much of you returning home to Farleigh at this time,[2] and I am anxious to know how you bear it; He who has supported you hitherto I know will not fail you. But I long to hear from you; and I hope, as you can, you will write to me. . . .

[2] It has been already mentioned that Mr. R. I. Wilberforce's wife had died at East Farleigh in the November of 1834, so that this was near to the first anniversary of her decease.

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Farnham Castle, Nov. 26, 1835.

My dearest Robert,—I will write, as far as I can, on any day of the week you wish; but just now, when moving about and visiting, my time is less at my disposal than at any other, for which reason I did not write on Monday. To take up the thread of our movements from Hanbury. . . . I was pleased at the Birmingham meeting with the evidently strong Church spirit which is rising there. The meeting was not much less than 3,000 strong, more than half men, and all cheering all 'the most offensive parts' of the Church system, *e.g.* tithe collecting, &c. Richard Spooner was in the chair, and spoke at the beginning and end of the meeting. He surprised me very much. I had expected a good speech, as far as power and words go, but he was dignified also. There certainly is a vast dignity in eloquence. And he was evidently highly appreciated by the people present. From Leamington we went on Friday last to Campden, and on Saturday on to Oxford. We were the guests of the M^c^Brides, who were very kind. On Sunday I heard Denison of Merton preach at St. Mary's, a good plain sermon much listened to, with no great talent, I thought, of any sort, but good. A great attendance of undergraduates. In the next place I heard Hamilton, son of Archdeacon Hamilton, late of Ch. Ch., now tutor at Merton. He and Denison have charge of St. Peter's. Hamilton preached with a good deal of feeling, and is thought a first-rate preacher. Then I heard Newman, who preached a beautiful sermon upon 'Whosoever receiveth one of these little ones'—the responsibility of parents *without*, and the support *with*, the true doctrine of election. How beautiful St. Mary's Church now is.

I was told by Dr. M^c^Bride that the Duke of Wellington had written to them to urge alteration, on the ground that the present position was one which could not be defended in the H. of Lords, which means *only* that it is hard to persuade Arthur, Duke of Wellington, to defend it. They have answered that they cannot carry anything, so it is no use crying

about it. I met Shuttleworth,[3] and in the course of conversation he told me that he thought the 'Practical View' the most perfect style of modern composition with which he was acquainted. He asked much about the Life. He has lost his chance of a Bishoprick. Newman is just going to publish another volume of sermons. Very many asked very kindly after you. —— was up; I did not much like him. He seemed to me conceited in a disagreeable way, as a toad would be conceited if its cold nature would allow of such an indulgence. . . . I went up to Checkendon and spent a day with my old people. . . . My dearest brother, I have thought of you many times lately, and wished much to be near enough to you to be able to cheer you as far as I could, but you are in better hands than mine. . . . Ever most affectionately your's,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

The last letter of the year, dated from Brighstone, December 9, 1835, refers to the first occasion of his having to preach before the University:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

I am sorry that your preaching turn was put in the vacation time; particularly as it proves you a dangerous character. M—— G——, on the other hand, may be trusted, as he goes up to preach in his turn the early part of next term. I also am less dangerous, and am going up on the 1st Sunday in Lent. I wish that I could read you the sermon I mean to preach, as I feel a little nervous about it. It is a parish one, altered a little, on that text, 'Forasmuch as they did not like to retain God,' &c., directed chiefly, in the first instance, to the undergraduate part, and obliquely to the Dons, on the progress of allowed sin from less to more.

Newman's sermon was a *very* striking one, so full of thought and simplicity of the Gospel and of practical holiness.

Thus ended the year 1835—a date with which it

[3] Warden of New College, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, 1840–1842.

is not merely convenient, but strictly accurate, to close the chapter of his 'First years at Brighstone.' He was now just thirty years of age, and by this time had spent five years and a half in his island parish. Five years more of the Brighstone life were yet to come. But with those years he was not merely beginning a fresh decade of his life and the second half of his Brighstone incumbency, but he was also entering on a wider sphere of interests and a larger range of occupations. Up to the end of 1835 he had been mainly busied in the working of his parish, he had won, in a marked degree, the warm affections of his Bishop, he had become the centre of the island clergy and a manifest power in his neighbourhood. With the year 1836 we observe a distinct advance upon what had gone before, gradual at first, and especially so during the years 1836 and 1837, while the work of his father's biography weighed heavily on his energies and made large inroads on his time, but yet most real and manifest and never intermitted, so that, when in the spring of 1838 its publication left him more at liberty, the general enlargement of capacity is strikingly apparent. These five years fall naturally into two divisions, of which the former will embrace the three years 1836–8, during which his first appearances were made as a select preacher at Oxford and his father's Life was published; while the second will comprise the final years 1839–40, which witnessed his remarkable *début* as a public speaker, both in London and the West of England, and at the close of which he was promoted by his steadfast patron, the Bishop of Winchester, to the Archdeaconry of Surrey and the Vicarage of Alverstoke.

Almost the only letter which has been preserved from Samuel Wilberforce to his mother belongs to the

year now ended; and it is interesting from its reference to his theological position, with regard to which his mother had evidently been writing to him. It is as follows:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Mrs. W. Wilberforce.

Brighstone, April 28, 1835.

My dearest Mother,—It is one of the drawbacks upon being so constantly employed in my most interesting work[4] that I have no time for writing. Many an inclination towards thus communicating with you has thus been checked; and even to-day I have time only for a few hurried lines. . . .

My dearest mother, I well know that we must expect to be calumniated. All persons must, who do not fall in with the fashion of the day; and above all those who offend that most irritable class, the self-contented religionists of small attainments, are sure to be maligned. Of all the points you mention some few only are true—as, for instance, that I do not understand the Articles in a Calvinistic sense. But I maintain that I understand them in their true sense. For though written in great part by Calvinists, they were not intended to maintain Calvinistic opinions. The errors they were aimed at were the errors of the Scholastic Philosophy, and it is only ignorance which makes many think that they refer to Calvinism where they really are aiming at quite another mark. For the rest I belong to no school. In many things I do not agree with the few Oxford Tracts I have read. But I do agree as far as I can with all these great lights whom God has from time to time given to his Church; with Hooker and Bramhall and Taylor, with Beveridge and Stillingfleet, and with the primitive Church of the first three centuries. It may be called Popery by an ignorant or a malicious latitudinarian; but, if I do not greatly mistake, it will one day be found that he was far nearer the Socinian heresy than I to the Romish inventions.—Your most affectionate son,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

[4] This refers to the biography of his father.

CHAPTER IV.

(1836-38.)

LIFE AT BRIGHSTONE—(continued).

VISITS TO OXFORD—OPPOSITION TO APPOINTMENT OF DR. HAMPDEN AS REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY—LETTERS—ACCOUNT OF A VISIT FROM IRVINGITES—WORK AT HIS FATHER'S LIFE—LONG VISIT TO LONDON—EXTRACTS FROM DIARIES—OFFER OF THE VICARAGE OF LEEDS—SPEECH AT PUBLIC MEETING AT WINCHESTER—SERMON AT SOUTHAMPTON ADVOCATING MISSIONARY BISHOPS—EXTRACTS FROM DIARY—LETTERS—OFFER OF EXCHANGE TO LEAMINGTON—FIRST SERMON AS SELECT PREACHER AT OXFORD—IN LONDON—EXTRACTS FROM DIARY—LETTER ON MR. J. H. NEWMAN'S BOOK ON 'JUSTIFICATION'—THE QUEEN'S CORONATION—INTERCOURSE WITH MR. TRENCH—MR. J. H. NEWMAN DECLINES HIS FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE 'BRITISH CRITIC'—DR. HOOK'S SERMON, 'HEAR THE CHURCH'—LETTERS—PUBLICATION OF THE LIFE OF MR. WILBERFORCE—LETTER TO MR. GLADSTONE WITH PRESENTATION COPY—MR. GLADSTONE'S REPLY.

DURING the early part of the year 1836 close and incessant work upon his father's biography, and upon Henry Martyn's Letters and Journals, was interrupted only by his attendance at the annual meeting of Rural Deans of the diocese at Farnham Castle, and by three journeys to Oxford. As to the former of these absences, it may here be mentioned that on February 12, 1836, he was appointed Rural Dean of the north-eastern division of the Isle of Wight. As to the latter, the first visit to Oxford was when he had to preach in his regular turn in the University Church on the first Sunday in Lent, February 21; the second and third were in March and May respectively, when he went to bear his part in the remonstrances which were provoked by the appointment of Dr. Hampden, then Pro-

fessor of Moral Philosophy, to the Regius Professorship of Divinity, held since 1829 by Dr. Burton. Dr. Burton died in January. Dr. Hampden was nominated to the vacant professorship in the following month, and then at once the controversy, which was destined in the end to bear such bitter fruit, burst into life. Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures, delivered in 1832, had always been regarded as adopting a mode of treating theological subjects which was subversive of all confidence in him as a teacher. Besides this, during the year 1833, Dr. Hampden had taken a leading part in supporting the Ministerial proposals for admitting Dissenters to the University—a course which, while it offended many in Oxford, was certainly calculated to recommend him to the Government of the day. The consequence was that seventy-three resident Fellows and Tutors of Colleges, of whom *forty* were acting as Tutors, or were otherwise connected with the discipline of their Colleges, signed a petition to the King against the appointment; while nine Heads of Houses joined in a similar remonstrance. These, however, were but the acts of individuals: in March official movement began. A Statute passed the Board of Heads, declaring that, having no confidence in Dr. Hampden's mode of treating theological subjects, the University could not allow him to judge of the qualifications of the select preachers at St. Mary's. When this Statute came before Convocation on March 22, the Proctors interposed their veto, and for the time proceedings were stayed. Meantime remonstrances and petitions against the appointment were being got up in all parts of the country; and, when in the following term new Proctors were in office, the Statute limiting the exercise of his functions by the new Professor passed the Convocation by the very large majority of

474 votes against 94, the names of those constituting the majority showing that political feeling was in no way concerned in the opposition; and there for several years the matter rested. This was just the kind of movement to rouse Samuel Wilberforce to the uttermost, and accordingly there are many notices of it in his letters. On January 22 he wrote to his brother Robert—

So poor Burton is dead! How sudden it must have been. Who will be his successor? I incline to Shuttleworth's chance as the best for us. Arnold and Hampden are the worst chances for us.

And on February 12—

On Thursday I go to Farnham to the synod of Rural Deans and officials, which lasts through Friday. On Saturday I go to Oxford, where I am to preach on Sunday, the first Sunday in Lent. You ought to have remembered that the *Ash Wednesday* sermon is always in Latin. (N.B.—Could we not pass a vote that Hampden should always preach in *Hebrew?*[1]) It is by the Vice-Chancellor's appointment at Burton's suggestion I was asked to be a select preacher next year, and this was his suggestion as a preparatory step. I suppose Hampden will not nominate one of my name. . . . How disgusting is Hampden's appointment, and how destructive of the Whig argument that if Bishops did not sit in the House of Lords they would be appointed for their theological and not their political attainments.

And a little later on we find him getting up a requisition in his own neighbourhood for a meeting on the same subject—

Have you done anything about Hampden? I have got about 3 of our clergy to sign a requisition to the Archdeacon to convene a meeting, which will go off to him to-morrow or the next day.

[1] Referring to the obscurity of style which was ascribed to Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures.

And on April 19—

I had a very pleasing letter from W. F. Hook the other day, giving an account of their diocesan meeting to petition, and speaking very affectionately of the Bishop. The Archbishop does not, I hear, now wish for any more petitions. What evident good the stir about Hampden has done! Doubtless Arnold would otherwise have been a bishop now.

The following letters of this date will give the most complete picture of his feelings and his movements. The former is to Miss Louisa Noel, perhaps the most intimate of the many intimate friends of his wife and of himself, and to whom he always wrote as his 'sister.' She was the daughter of the Hon. and Rev. Gerard Noel, Vicar of Romsey and brother of the Earl of Gainsborough, and was one of his most constant correspondents. Fortunately, a long series of his letters to her have been preserved,[2] extending as far as the year 1849, and they will be largely quoted in the sequel :—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Miss Louisa Noel.

Brighstone Rectory, April 1, 1836.

My dearest Sister,—. . . You do not know yet how very nearly you were seeing me suddenly walk in last week at Campden. I went up to Oxford to vote on Dr. Hampden's business, and had all but determined to mount the Worcester coach and find myself again under the shadow of your beautiful tower and the porch of your dear and hospitable house. However, upon the whole, I gave way to many reasons and stayed at Oxford, though not without a secret hope that I should find myself again at Oxford next term, and then should either see you there, or find my way to you at Campden. We had quite a family gathering at Oxford; for the family direct, there were Henry, Robert, and myself; for the family collateral, Henry, Henry Manning, G. Ryder, and myself; and all on the right side. There was a great deal that very much

[2] The earliest remaining letter to Miss L. Noel was quoted on page 74.

delighted me in my visit, especially some very long conversations with Newman upon several of the most mysterious parts of the Christian Revelation, the Trinity, &c., as well as upon some of the greatest practical difficulties to faith arising from the present torn state of Christendom; and it was really most sublime as an exhibition of human intellect when in parts of our discussions Newman kindled, and poured forth a sort of magisterial announcement in which Scripture, Christian antiquity deeply studied and thoroughly imbibed, humility, veneration, love of truth, and the highest glow of poetical feelings, all impressed their own pictures upon his conversation. We had, too, there τὸν Μούσαις φίλον ἄνδρα; we had Bowden, the 'specimen of an attached laity.' I asked Newman who was 'the friend, whose stray observations,'[3] &c. It was Keble. 'I have expressed it ill, and must alter it; but what I meant was this. I saw that when Keble's sermons were published persons would think *he* had taken things from me because mine were published first, whereas he had often incidentally suggested to me the first thought.' Will you ask Charles to get and read Newman's last volume of sermons.

Did you hear anything of Froude's death, of the quietness and peace with which that mighty intellect left its tabernacle as if it had been the departing breath of a fainting child—on a Sunday—when his father had read the Liturgical Service with him, and had just finished a sermon. He was, I think, upon the whole, possessed of the most original powers of thought of any man I have ever known intimately. He has left MSS. behind him enough to make 2 or 3 volumes, all unfinished, but which will be published by Newman or by Keble; which is not yet settled. There is a paper of his on ancient Liturgies in the 'Tracts for the Times,' which I have not read yet enough to have an opinion of its truth; but which, if he wishes to be set a-thinking upon a set of most important subjects, I beg to submit to Charles, with my love, for well-weighing reflections. . . .

[3] This refers to the concluding paragraph in Mr. Newman's 'Advertisement' to his second volume of Sermons, then recently published, in which he had expressed 'his great obligations, in the matter of these volumes, to the unconscious assistance of a friend, with whom he is in habits of familiarity, and *whose stray observations* he has pleasure in detecting in them.'—Newman's *Sermons*, vol. ii. p. x.

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Mr. Charles Anderson.

Brighstone Rectory, May 31, 1836.

My dearest Charles,—I was meditating a letter to you from the impulse of my last visit to Oxford, when your's has come and stirred up my lingering intentions. I went up to both meetings on the subject of Dr. Hampden; and, although it was a painful object in itself which brought us together, yet there was much that was pleasing in the circumstances of the meeting. The last was especially pleasant in these particulars. It was a very pleasant thing to be meeting and getting well acquainted with Sam[1] Wood,[4] of whom I saw a great deal and whom I like exceedingly. But judge of my surprise on hearing that old Boyle, who had been at Tonbridge on some business, had determined to come up, and sure enough, 'Sir,' he did come, and very hearty and very pleasant he was; and we had a great deal of talk together about old times, and dined together in Hall, and went to the Debating Society together, and sat in common room together, and in the rooms where I was housed, which were poor Froude's old rooms. In short, 'Sir,' if you had been there, the thing would have been perfect, and there you would have been, if your name had been on the books, and would have been on the Church side, as I see very well by the good old Church tone of your letter. For whatever people may say, Charles, depend upon it there was no political feeling in the matter. It was loose Churchmen against sound Churchmen, whatever were their politics—as in our own College might be seen by Sam[1] Wood and George Denison both coming down from London to vote with us. Old Wither came on the other side, almost the only Oriel man who did. . . .

I am very glad that you so much like Newman's sermons; the third volume is my especial favourite. It is, indeed, a

[4] Mr. Wood was a Liberal in politics and brother to the present Lord Halifax, who, as Sir Charles Wood, was Chancellor of the Exchequer in Lord John Russell's Ministry of 1846–52, President of the Board of Control in Lord Aberdeen's Ministry of 1852–55, First Lord of the Admiralty in Lord Palmerston's Ministry of 1855–58, and Indian Secretary in Lord Palmerston's Ministry of 1859–65.

magnificent thing. Keble is just going to publish a volume w^h^ will, I suspect, be admirable. How different Oxford was in our time. There was something so miserably low in ——, and such a want of that high tone of intellect and morality which they have now reached. At the same time I fear they are pushing some things too far. Do you see the 'Tracts for the Times?' They are very well worth your reading. There are two octavo volumes now published of them, which I wish you would get and read. It is the view of Baptism which seems to me to be pushed too far. I mean the deadly state to which they picture sin after baptism to reduce men. . . .

I must stop, as it is past 11. With our very kindest remembrances to Mrs. Anderson, believe me to remain, my dearest Charles, your's very affect^y^,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

To this period belongs also his earliest letter, which has been preserved, to one with whom afterwards he came to be on the closest terms of confidence and friendship, Dr. Hook, then Vicar of Coventry, afterwards so well known as Vicar of Leeds for upwards of twenty years (1837 to 1859), and subsequently (1859–1875) Dean of Chichester. The letter has a claim to be preserved, from its expression of opinion as to the revival of Convocation, which is the more interesting in consideration of the all-important part which in after times Bishop Wilberforce was to play in its revival.

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. W. F. Hook, Coventry.

Brighstone Rectory, April 12, 1836.

My dear Sir,—. . . Your account of your meeting is full of interest, and I rejoice in the concurrent testimonies which bespeak the greater harmony of the rural clergy. I fear that in London old feuds still rage. The exhibitions at the S. P. C. K. are very painful. With the objects of your petition (as well as the *præmunire* part) I entirely concur. Some of the

recent meetings, I see, have proceeded to petition for a restoration of Convocation. It is a painful admission; but I am persuaded that we could not risk a Convocation. The examples commonly alleged fail, I think, of agreement with our case. The Kirk Establishment of Scotland, the Methodist Conference, &c., proceed upon generally admitted and maintained general principles; but the great bulk of our clergy are still so ignorant of Church principles that we have no sufficient bond of union to resist the necessary divisions which must always spring from the shades of individual opinions, and we should fight in the presence of our enemies.

We are all trembling for your diocese, or rather for Lichfield,[5] for Coventry is to be given (is it not?) to Worcester. I wish we might hope to see you here. It would give us both great pleasure; you would find us now very accessible, and the gratification of renewing old associations may, perhaps, persuade you to make the effort. Do think of it seriously, and believe me to remain ever very sincerely your's,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

The next letter carries us to an altogether different subject. It will be within the recollection of some of our readers that it was during the early years of Mr. S. Wilberforce's clerical life that the excitement caused by the ministry and preaching of Mr. Edward Irving was at its height. Frequent references to Mr. Irving's disciples, both in his letters and in his diary, show that he was not unobservant of this remarkable wave of religious fervour. But the letter itself is inserted not merely in order that the subject should be not utterly overlooked, but more especially because it gives an early example both of that lightning-like promptitude in fastening upon the vital point of a matter in discussion, and also of that tenacity in holding his opponent to the precise point on which he chose to give him battle, which marked Bishop Wilber-

[5] The diocese of Lichfield was then vacant by the death of Bishop Ryder.

force in after years. The attendant circumstances are sufficiently explained by the letter itself:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Brighstone Rectory, April 13, 1836.

My dearest Robert,—. . . On Monday last I received the card of Capt[n] Gambier, 'desiring a private interview to make an important communication.' I was prepared for an Irvingite interview, knowing that orders had been issued from Albury that every officiating clergyman in the land should be visited by a testimony from one of those whom they so blasphemously term 'angels.' I came to him with Emily; he had Brother Silent with him, for they go in pairs; and he entered upon his message, which was to announce the formation of 'The Church,' *etc.* I kept him entirely to one point—his commission to come at all—saying that if he could satisfy me there, of course I would receive, or at least most earnestly weigh his message. He tried to escape over and over again; when I always said, 'We are wandering from the point,' *etc.* I called on him to show an ordinary, or the signs of an extraordinary, commission. Of course he could do neither, and, as they admit the foundation of Church principles, I was able to silence him completely though not to convince him.

We discussed for an hour; at last he quoted for the 50th time 'the tongues,' and being driven to it quoted them as a sign to unbelievers. Upon this I answered that I had examined them upon the testimony of most able and impartial witnesses, and was convinced that they were not superhuman. On this he rose, declaring that I had blasphemed the Holy Ghost; and he denounced woe. I said, 'And before you leave my room I must deliver to you *my* message, and I do it most solemnly and in the name of God. You have come to me claiming to be a messenger from God, speaking in His name by direct commission; and I have tried your claim and found it false. I tell you, therefore, that you are under an awful delusion, and are guilty of a dreadful sin. You are one of those false prophets mentioned in Jeremiah xiv. who say

the Lord sent me, when the Lord hath not sent you, and you have much reason to fear the burning fire of His offended jealousy,' *etc.* And in much such terms we parted. It is a very painful sight to witness so strong a deceit.

I had yesterday a very kind and pleasing letter from W. F. Hook. He gave me an account of their meeting at Coventry to petition the King, *etc.*, and said he never saw so much union amongst the clergy of all parties[6]. . . . Believe me to be, my dearest Robert, ever your most affectionate brother,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

On June 13, after long-protracted illness, Henry Sargent, the sole surviving son of Mr. John Sargent, died at Lavington; and thus it was that, through coming into possession of the Lavington property, as will be seen from the following letter, Mr. S. Wilberforce ultimately became, what he delighted to designate himself, 'a Sussex squire,' as well as a bishop:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Mr. C. Anderson.

[Without date; but postmark is August 19, 1836.]

My dearest Charles,—We returned from Lavington early in the week after our dear brother's funeral, and about a fortnight ago were joined here by Mrs. Jno. Sargent and Mrs. Sargent. Mrs. J. Sargent is very low still. This last blow has taken from her the engrossing object to which the cares of a mother's heart have been for years directed; and she *feels* as if she were now useless from feeling none to whom she is supremely necessary. Still she has the best consolation for herself and the best hopes for him; she has a healthy mind and a cheerful temper; and, though life at her age can never be again what it has been, because she can have no new objects like those which are taken from her, yet I doubt not that after a while she will be again cheerful and happy. Mrs. Sargent at 81 has all the freshness of youth, and enjoys a good 'go' and a pleasure excursion which shall occupy the

[6] Referring to the meeting to petition against Dr. Hampden's appointment as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

day as much as any one. Nothing seems to tire her. I am sorry to say that she leaves us to-morrow, going on for a few days to Bransgore to visit Henry and Mary.

Keble has been for six weeks at the little inn at Freshwater Gate for Mrs. K.'s health, who is alarmingly delicate; it has been very pleasant for us; as he has been over here and we over to him very often. He has the simplest and most childlike mind conceivable, playing with his nephew and a son of Davison's on the shore, as if he had never a higher thought in his head than how he should make 2 boys happiest. Robert and I are very busy about the Life, which we are very anxious to get out by this next spring, if possible. . . . You asked about the Lavington property. It is settled upon Emily at her mother's death, but it is so much encumbered by family arrangements that it is not likely to come to anything in our lifetime. Ever, dearest Charles, your very affectionate

SAM^{L} WILBERFORCE.

The last two months of 1836 and the whole of January and February, 1837, were spent in London, much of the latter at his relative's, Lord Calthorpe's, during which period he was almost entirely engrossed by the work of his father's Life. Some extracts from his diary, at the beginning of 1837, will exhibit what were his other interests and occupations, and will also serve to show the gradual widening of his acquaintance with his contemporaries. But by far the most critical incident of the period was the offer, mentioned in the diary of Saturday, February 4, which came to him, through Sir R. Inglis, of the important Vicarage of Leeds, which for some days he weighed most anxiously. Ultimately, as will be seen from the letters and the diary, as quoted below, the offer was declined, on the score of health, though by reason of his Yorkshire connections, independently of its intrinsic importance, the position could not fail to have attractions for him.

Jan. 1, 1837.—Morning some time by myself. At 11 to Margaret Street Chapel, where Dodsworth read prayers, and I preached and assisted in administering the Eucharist. Then early dinner. Then prepared sermon for the even^{g}, which preached at S. Dunstan's.

Jan. 2.—Up late, tired by yesterday. Morning at the Life, beginning preparation of 1797–8. Afternoon, called—Ryders, Erskine, Dodsworth, with whom sat a little. Dined at Snow's. Met Carus, Harding, &c. Harding of St. Anne's, Blackfriars, evidently rash; wished to have an afternoon communion and exhortation instead of prayers, and saw no *à priori* objection in its strangeness in the Occidental Church, &c. Carus very pleasing, mentioned some striking things of old Simeon—especially the diminution of his *vehemence* from the commencement of his illness.

Jan. 3, *Tuesday.*—Called on M^{c}Call. Stayed with him some time. Brit. Museum. Then to meeting of Chr^{n} Know^{e} Soc^{y}, where Establishment party prevalent.

4*th*, *Wednesday.*—To Islington with M^{c}Call. The Synod till 5, and then home, where had Dodsworth, (2) Anderdons, H. Carey, and Bramstone to dinner. Some rational conversation.

Friday, 6.—Dined Anderdon's. Feast of Epiphany. At Dodsworth's chapel. Assisted in y^{e} administration of y^{e} Eucharist.

Sat. 7.—Breakfasted at Fulham with the Bp. of London. Talked over James Stephen's plan, and the Commissioner's reports—freely. The Bishop winning through openness and kindness, but not convincing through strong *one-viewedness.*

Sunday, 8.—Morning with Mrs. S—— to Trinity, Chelsea. Burgess—clever and interesting sermon. Then with Mrs. S—— and Mrs. Carey to old Mr. Wilkinson—venerable, familiar, earnest, but obscure and dangerous in statements.

. . . . . .

Sunday, 22.—Mor^{g}, Dodsworth's. Excellent sermon. Aft^{n}, Westminster Abbey with G. D. Ryder; Bishop of Hereford.

Wednesday, 25.—Conversion of St. Paul. Mor^{g} to Dodsworth's and helped him to administer Eucharist.

Sunday, 29.—Morning to Dodsworth's. Preached and

assisted at the Eucharist. Home afternoon, read some of 'Tracts for the Times.' Evening, read prayers for Dodsworth. Long talk, evening, with —— about right of administering Eucharist.

Sat. 4.—Sir Robert Inglis came and proposed Leeds. Robert and I walked and discussed. Wrote to my Bishop, and Mrs. Sargent, &c.

Sunday, 5.—Much thought about Leeds.

Monday, 6.—Saw Sir R. Inglis, &c. Heard from my Bishop. More disposed to think Leeds my duty. Dined P. Williams with G. D. Ryder, &c. Then off in mail for Farnham, where very late.

Tuesday, 7.—Bird, &c., to breakfast, Lady Raffles and Mathison. Much talk about Leeds with the Bishop, Mrs. S—— and Dallas. Off at one and to town by 6. On the road quite settled to accept, if health, &c. Saw G. Babington and Locock, who forbid. Down to the House. Saw Sir Robert Inglis. Told him. *He asked me to recommend.* Debate till very late.

Wednesday 8.—To Sir R. Inglis early. *Mentioned Robert.* To Margaret Street Chapel.

What Bishop Sumner's advice was at the interview named above, on February 7, might be inferred from the following letter, written immediately on receiving Mr. S. Wilberforce's communication of Saturday, February 4; but the matter is not left to inference only. After urging the many objections to the post the Bishop said, 'I will do, in this instance, what I have never yet done to any other person. I will tell you what I had in my own mind intended with regard to you. I have proposed, whenever the time comes, to place you at St. Mary's, Southampton. But even this is, of course, not a post equal in importance to Leeds.' It may here be added that it was the same living to which, nearly five-and-thirty years after (in 1871) Bishop Wilberforce appointed his youngest son, Basil.

Bishop of Winchester to Rev. S. Wilberforce.

Farnham Castle, Feby. 5, 1837.

My dear Wilberforce,—Never had bishop a more disturbing question put to him on a Sunday morning. I really think, after the best consideration I have been able to give it (and it has occupied far more of my thoughts than was convenient), that I cannot give an answer conscientiously without seeing you. There are two or three points of great importance connected with the subject, on which I want information, to which I have not access here, and which ought, in justice to myself and you, to be known before I give an opinion likely to have the influence you hint upon your decision. Why did you not come down last night? There must have been some other reason than that you give. Why did you not come? What right had Sir Robert to cast his eye on you?

I see all the importance of the post, and I do not hide from myself that by God's blessing you might exercise in it an immense influence for good. In this respect the proposal differs in my judgment immeasurably from the former London offer. But I cannot repress the inquiry, 'How long would your lamp burn?' *Not an hour.* And just before, or just after your own, would expire that of Emily, choaked with coal smoke. I think you must come down. And why should you not? An issue of such importance ought not to be settled by return of post. Ever your most affectionate,

C. WINTON.

On the 8th, immediately after the interview with Sir R. Inglis, specified in the diary, he thus wrote to his brother:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Grosvenor Square, Ash Wednesday.

My dearest Robert,—Yesterday I was at Farnham Castle until one o'clock, and the result of all my consideration was that I could not refuse the post with a clear conscience, if

there appeared to be a reasonable hope of my health standing it. After a great deal of struggle, I confess, I made my mind fully up to this conclusion. Emily acquiesced in it with pain, but full submission. I then went to Locock. He thought Emily and Herbert quite able to live there perfectly, but was sure Arnie could not live in the town. Still she need *not* always live in the town. I then consulted him about myself. He was disposed to think it very doubtful, but that with care I might manage it. He promised, however, to think it over and give me a better opinion to-day. I went on to G. Babington, who, after a patient and kind consideration of everything, said he had no doubt that I was unequal to it. I had charged him very solemnly to deal with me honestly as in the sight of God. I said to him, 'I have no bias to suit. I want a medical opinion. I want the truth. Of course there are some things to be sacrificed in undertaking such a post. I have made up my mind to the sacrifice.' He was quite decided, and to-day came Locock to give the same answer, 'quite decidedly after mature consideration.' Therefore *I have declined.* But now comes the point on which you must answer me by return of post. *Will you take it?* I have promised to bring Sir R. Inglis your answer on Friday. It is not nearly so certain if you say 'yes' that you will be tied by the election, for I could not get yesterday to Sir R. in time for post, and to-day—to-morrow there being a meeting of the trustees—Mr. Hall had written to say it was *very probable* Mr. S. Wilberforce would consent to act if elected. Of my election, he says, there was not a shadow of doubt. There is a difficulty in *substituting* another brother. But I know no other man so well fitted as yourself. You would govern Yorkshire, and it would not to you personally be so great a sacrifice, all your uxorial connections living in the neighbourhood. It is a *grand* situation, much grander upon close inspection than I at first thought; neither do I see why it should be so contentious. Coventry was as bad, and Hook has managed that. Either *write* or *come* in answer to this as speedily as you possibly can. I am writing in the greatest haste, having just returned from Sir Robert Inglis. Kindest love to my dearest mother. G. Babington says he thinks you

are strong enough, but you should come and see him perhaps yourself. Ever, in great affection and haste, your very much attached brother,

SAM^{L} WILBERFORCE.

On the next day the Bishop wrote thus, in respect of Mr. S. Wilberforce's decision :—

The Bishop of Winchester to Rev. S. Wilberforce.

Farnham Castle, Feby. 9, 1837.

My dear Wilberforce,—I have just returned from Godalming, and have only time to send one word to say how very warmly I rejoice at the decision, and at the manner in which you have arrived at it. I could not well have been satisfied, thinking as I do of you and of Leeds, without your having accepted it, as far as your own will was concerned ; and at the same time I am most thankful that your way was made so very clear by the concurrent testimony of opinions medical and friendly. God give you, if it be His will, a long and extensive career of usefulness in the South. My kindest love to Mrs. Wilberforce, and most fervent congratulations. I breathe again.

We shall see you here most gladly. You must give us at least one clear day, as many more as possible. In greatest haste, ever y^{r} most affec^{te},

C. W.

And thus Samuel Wilberforce *was* reserved for a long and extensive career of usefulness in the South, while Walter Farquhar Hook was removed to eclipse the work he had already done at Coventry, by doing it over again, on a far larger scale, and by bringing it to far larger issues, at Leeds. Idle as all such conjectures are, the fact of their being so can never quite prevent a momentary speculation as to the modifications it might have effected in the history of the Church of England, had Samuel Wilberforce become Vicar of Leeds at the age of thirty-one, and had Walter Farquhar Hook remained at Coventry. Differing widely

in their gifts, in their training, and in the spheres of duty which they were called to fill, no two men did more to bring the Church revival of the nineteenth century to bear upon the Church at large. To the one it was allotted to form and to realise a new ideal of the work and character of an English Bishop; to the other it was given to show what the parish priest of a great town might be and do. The future historian of the Church of England will delight to record their friendship as well as their services and achievements.

The rest of the year was spent between Brighstone, London, and Winchester, with occasional visits at Farnham Castle, while the Bishop was more than once a guest at Brighstone. Frequently, too, he was a speaker at important public meetings, and it was in the spring of this year that his great power and readiness in reply was first brought into notice, at a meeting in Winchester, of which the memory long survived in the neighbourhood. The occasion was this:—A great county meeting was held for the purpose of setting on foot a Diocesan Church Building Society, with the Duke of Wellington in the chair; Lord Palmerston was among the speakers; and in the course of his speech he took a line which Mr. S. Wilberforce considered inconsistent with true Churchmanship. The consequence was that he attacked Lord Palmerston's remarks with an ability and eloquence which quite carried away the meeting, but, at the same time, with a vehemence which caused some of those present to remonstrate with the Duke of Wellington, as chairman, for having allowed so young a clergyman to proceed unchecked. The Duke replied that it had occurred to him to interpose, but that on looking again at the speaker he felt sure that, had he done so, he would only have diverted upon himself the stream of

his indignant eloquence, and 'I assure you,' he added, 'that I would have faced a battery sooner.' The occasion is briefly referred to in the diary as under:—

Thursday, Mar. 30.—Breakfasted at Archdeacon's. Mr. Noel and Louisa there. Bishop came. Discussed the meeting at St. John's Room. Very good meeting. I spoke, answering Lord Palmerston well.

And again in two letters, bearing date April 13 and April 26, 1837, to Mr. C. Anderson:—

I quite agree with you in what you say about the misery of having to court the Dissenters in order to maintain political consistency. I saw it very curiously at the Winchester Ch. meeting, where Lord Palmerston was *really* speaking throughout to his *Dissenting* constituents. It was curious at Newport[7] that when I, who had moved thanks to Lord Yarborough, proposed them and had said that 'I rejoiced in seeing one of his order gild afresh his hereditary honours with good deeds, because I believed that with the maintenance of that order was bound up the happiness of England,' the Radicals present instantly got up a good *hiss*. I cannot help thinking that hissing the peerage in the abstract, though represented by the Liberal earl, would a little open his eyes.

I was at Winton at the great meeting we held there to form a Diocesan Church Building Society. The Duke of Wellington presided; Lord Palmerston, &c. &c., were there. Upon the whole it was a most gratifying meeting. On the Saturday the Bishop came to us here, and on Monday we had a meeting for the same purpose at Newport, Lord Yarborough in the chair, which went off excellently well, and Lord Yarborough was delighted with himself and it and us.

The more domestic incidents of the period were his officiating, on March 29, at the marriage of his brother Robert with Miss Jane Legard, and later on in the year, the decease, July 24, of his sister-in-law, Mrs.

[7] At a similar meeting a few days after.

H. E. Manning. His time was still largely occupied with his father's Life, and with arrangements for its publication, and it is a curious example of the insatiable activity of his mind that months before this work was off his hands, even so early as November 9, he was already planning the History of the American Church, which he published seven years afterwards, in 1844. It was in connection with this that his mind began to be specially directed towards the importance of Episcopal organisation in missionary work—a subject which he treated in a sermon, preached at All Saints', Southampton, November 10, at the anniversary of the S.P.G. and the S.P.C.K. That it had been on his mind for some time is shown by the subjoined letter, from the Rev. J. H. Newman, in reply to some inquiries made early in the year; and that the sermon created some sensation is evident from the entries in his diary,[8] which are given later on.

Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. S. Wilberforce.

Oriel College, May 12, 1837.

My dear Wilberforce,—Your letter of this morning opens a very interesting subject. Doubtless the only right way of missionary-izing is by bishops, and the agitation of the question must do good. Perhaps you are hardly called upon even to say *how* it is to be done in the case of a given society, as the Ch. Miss. —it being at once a sufficient object at first to make out the *duty*, and, when it is made out, to fulfil it being other persons' concern quite as much as yours. If you prove your point, others are bound to co-operate with you in acting upon it. At the same time, of course, it would soften opposition to show that the thing was not only right, but practicable.

[8] The diary contains also an example of his strict conscientiousness in reproving the faults of his neighbours and its happy effect :—

Friday, November 3.—Wrote to Lord —— fully, about his taking God's name in vain.

Sat. 4.—Lord —— very cordial, thanked me for my letter.

Tuesday 7.—Lord —— quite correct in his language and very cordial.

I suppose that, in the present state of the Church of England, we cannot expect the Bps. to move or follow. I forget how the law stands; but I *think* the question of law was made the objection to our Bps. consecrating Bp. Luscombe—not that of ecclesiastical order. At the same time, it would be an inconsistency (w^d^ it not?) in an *English* Society getting Bps. from Scotland? Is there any precedent in the English Church of a Bp. being sent among the heathen? Could not the difficulty be met by getting Daniel Wilson and his colleagues to consecrate; if the consent of the Calcutta, &c., Government was requisite, I suppose they might join it. But one should like to try the powers of at least *colonial* bishops to do without the State. Is Calcutta a metropolitan see, or under Canterbury? If the former, it is free to act without the English Church; at least I assume Canterbury would not claim such patriarchal dominion over it.

I am exceedingly glad you are stirring the question, and think it a very happy thought. The very stirring it will be of great use. Any definite questions you send me I will answer if I can; but I suspect you will want an ecclesiastical *lawyer*.

When you wrote to me sometime since about the passage in Calvin, I did not know where to look for it; but now I send it you. After quoting a passage from Cyprian's 'De Unitate,' in which the connexion between Christ and the Episcopate is enforced, that the Church is set up in Christ, &c., he says:—

'Talem nobis hierarchiam si exhibeant, in quâ sic emineant Episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent, ut ab illo tanquam unico capiti pendeant, et ad ipsum referantur; in quâ sic inter se fraternam societatem colant, ut non alio nodo quam ejus veritati sint colligati, tum vero nullo non anathemati dignos fatear, si qui erunt, qui non eam reverenter summâque obedientiâ observent. Hæc vero mendax hierarchia larva quâ superbiunt quid omnino habet simile? Unus principatum, Christi vice, tenet Pontifex Romanus,' &c.—('De Necessitate Reformandæ Ecclesiæ,' p. 81, towards the end of the treatise).

—Your's very sincerely,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The entries in the diary are these:—

Friday (*Nov.* 10).—Off by ¼ to 7 for Calbourne on horseback. Thence with Woodrooffe to Cowes and South^{ton}. Arrived just at 11. Received by Grey of Dibdin, Adm^{l} Tinling, and Cap^{tn} Du Cane. Then to All Saints'—preached. All struck with view about Miss^{y} Bishops, and pressed publishing, Warden Barter especially strong Thence to meeting, where subject renewed and memorial determined on to P'rop^{n} Gosp. Soc^{y}. All gratified with sermon. Dinner at Horne's. Much talk. I defended the Ch. Miss^{y} Soc^{y}.

Sat. Nov. 11.—Sent off sermon to the Bishop, with a letter asking for corrections.

Friday, 24.—Bishop's letter, with my Southampton sermon —perplexed. I am in a false position with him. I do *not* hold what he *rightly* dislikes in Pusey and Newman, &c., and I hardly know how to disavow *this* without seeming also to disavow what I *do* hold, being more High Church in *feeling* than he is. Lord, keep me humble, and free from the fear of man, *which bringeth a snare.*

The part which, years afterwards, Bishop Wilberforce took in the sending forth of our first real Missionary Bishop,[9] the lamented Bishop Mackenzie, and the exclamation commonly ascribed to J. H. Newman, then, alas! long withdrawn from the English Church, that if the Church of England entered upon such a course as this she must become the Catholic Church of the World, will be fresh in the recollection of many readers.

The close of the year saw also the publication of his 'Letters and Journals of Henry Martyn,' with its prefixed sketch of Mr. John Sargent's life.

Sunday, 19 (*Nov.*).—This week my Martyn out, and a very kind letter from Sir R. Inglis acknowledging it.

Sunday, Nov. 26,—Very kind letters this week about

[9] Bishop Wilberforce was also the most active member of the Committee of Convocation on Missionary Bishops; and his diary, May 19, 1860, specially records drafting its report.

Martyn from Lord Calthorpe, Aunt Ros[d], W. Sargent, G. D. Ryder, and Bishop of Winton.

With a remark or two from December letters to his brother Robert touching the recently published 'Remains' of his former friend, R. H. Froude, and certain rumours of his becoming Rector of Bath, all notices of the year 1837 may be closed. His words are :—

Henry's accounts of Froude's 'Remains' truly grieve me. They will, I fear, do irreparable injury. He says, 'He seems to hate the Reformers.'

'Have you heard that I am Rector of Bath, and Henry Rector of Brighstone? This is Newport news. The first part I hear also from Bath—(1) by letter from Pearson, (2) by Fenwick, (3) by Dowell, and (4) from London. I do not believe it, because I think I should have known if it were so.

Charles Pearson, from Bath, writes me word that the good people there tell him *one of us* is to be the new (Simeonite)[1] Rector. He asks if it be me, and invites me *chez lui*, if I like, to spy out the ground. Doubtless it is a lie. The Simeonites are not likely to invite us. It is, I suppose, a most responsible situation. I prognosticate that Marsh, of Colchester, will be the man.

The year 1838 found him hard at work at his father's Life, but some of the earliest entries in his diary show a sad presentiment of the blow, which, in his wife's death, three years later, was only too surely to fall upon himself :—

Sunday (Jan.) 7.—Found letter from Mrs. Cary about Eugenia Smith's death. Her poor husband! *I feel on the edge of the same precipice;* but I hope can rather more put my trust in God than I could of old.

[1] The advowson of the Rectory of Bath had just been sold (in May 1837) by the Corporation, under the provisions of the Municipal Act, and was purchased by Mr. C. Simeon, for the sum of 6,330*l.*, of which amount about half was contributed by residents in the city. Mr. Simeon died shortly after, having conveyed the right of presentation to his five trustees.

Sunday, 21.—Read some of Jeremy Taylor and 'Froude's Remains' in Review. I shrink from the severe countenance of perfect devotion to God despicably. Lord, have pity on my miserable weakness; and yet while I so pray I am scarce sincere, for I fear being *scourged into devotedness*. Lord, give me a will for Thee. I wish earnestly that I more wished to be as a flame of fire in Thy service, passionless for earth, and impassioned for Thee. I have realised to-day *leaving the future*. I could torture myself almost into madness if HE had not said, 'As thy day,' &c.

Two days after the above touching entry his second, and now eldest surviving, son, Reginald Garton, was born; and he hastened to communicate his relief from his long anxiety to his friend Anderson:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Mr. C. Anderson.

Brighstone Rectory, 2 o'clock P.M., Jan 23, 1838.

My dear[st] Charles,—You will rejoice, I know, with us when I tell you that an hour ago my wife was carried safely through her trial, and made the joyful mother of a fine boy, who with her promises to do well.

I cannot express to you all the feelings which, under all the circumstances of the case, rush through my mind. The collapse of the mind is something like the return of muscular action to its regular course after over-tension of those wonderful fibres.

I liked your last letter exceedingly, and I hope you will write again often. I have not time just now to answer you, but in a few weeks I shall have, and will. We are almost out. Murray prints 7,500 for the first edition; an immense sale. He had begun with 5,000; but he says the '*inordinate* demand' requires 7,500 as his first beginning.

I agree with all *you say* about the Oxford School; but *I have some fears*. When did the mind of man not run into extremes? My principal fears are, that they will lead to the depression of true individual spirituality of mind in the reaction of their minds from the *self-idolising tendency* of the late leading religious party, by leading others to elevate solely the *systematic* and communion parts of Xty.; that they will

disgust some well-intentioned Churchmen by a fanciful imitation of antiquity, and drive them into lower depths of 'Peculiarity.'[2] I cannot use all their language about the Eucharist; I cannot bear Pusey's new sin after baptism. They hold up a glorious standard of holiness, and for *us*, my dear Charles, who know well the hopes of the Gospel, and can supply all they leave deficient, it is the very thing needful; but there are ignorant and bowed-down souls who need a more welcoming treatment than their views of penitence will allow. I do not know that I make myself clear. Do you understand me?

'The Vicar of Wrexhill'[3] is meant, you know, for the Vicar of Harrow-on-the-Hill, Mr. Cunningham. It is a most abominable personal attack.

Good-bye, my dearest Charles.—Ever yours very affec^{y},

SAM^{L} WILBERFORCE.

At this time, another opportunity was presented for removing to a more conspicuous sphere of duty. It has been already seen how anxiously, in 1837, he had weighed the question of accepting or declining the important Vicarage of Leeds, which was subsequently accepted by Dr. Hook. Now, in January, 1838, he received, from Dr. Hook, a proposal for the exchange of his Rectory of Brighstone for the Vicarage of Leamington, to which he returned the following reply:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. Dr. Hook, Leeds.

Brighstone Rectory, Jan. 29, 1838.

My dear Hook,—It is impossible for me to mistake the motive of your kind letter, or to feel other than obliged to you for your too favourable estimate of my talents for usefulness. So much your conclusion requires me to say. And now for

[2] The word 'Peculiarity' was used by Samuel Wilberforce and his friends with reference to the more pronounced members of the Evangelical School, whom they called 'the Peculiars.'

[3] Referring to the novel of that name recently published by Mrs. Trollope.

your proposal. It is perfectly true that after a severe struggle with my inclinations, and taking the best advice I could, I had resolved to leave Brighstone and accept the offer of the trustees of the Vicarage of Leeds, and that this determination was reversed by a very strong medical opinion. Now although the situation you name cannot be compared in importance of position with the town of Leeds, yet it is vastly more important than my present cure; and, if it came as the former proposal came, I should feel obliged to give it my most serious consideration before I replied to it; for the ground of health could not settle this. But the question seems to me at once, and *in limine*, settled by the absence of that *simplicity* of arrangement which distinguishes a call of Providence from an arrangement of our own seeking. It is an exchange you propose; and I have nothing to exchange. I have no doubt that my Patron would feel, if I were to propose this arrangement to him (for I should feel so if I were in his place) that he could not agree to such a substitution, without as full an acquaintance with, and approval of, the party to be settled here, as would lead him, without any view to exchange, originally to place him here. For remember how a conscientious Bishop, wedded to his diocese, must feel as to the employment of his patronage for which *he* is responsible, and you will, I think, see that he could not do less than this. I say this, never having heard my Bishop's view upon the matter, but feeling no doubt that it would be what I have expressed. With this conviction, for the quietness of my own mind, I enter no further into the question. But if you wish it, I have not the least objection to lay the matter at once before him for his decision; and, if that should not settle the question, I would then most seriously weigh it.

Only let me say one thing more, to which I am led by a casual expression in your letter. You do not, I hope, make me this offer thinking that I belong to the school of the 'Tracts for the Times.' I admire most highly the talents of some of those men: I revere far more their high and self-denying holiness and singleness of purpose: but I cannot agree with them in all their leading views of doctrine (*e.g.* Pusey's, as far as I understand it, view of Sin after Baptism), and I often

find in practical matters that I differ from them, on points, and in ways, in which men commonly charge those who differ from themselves with wrong-headedness, but in which, as it seems to me, they are for enforcing an ancient practice at the expense of a still more ancient principle. I only say this because your letter calls for confidential openness ; and, since we know each other's minds less than we did, my taking, as you know, a high view of the Church of Christ, and most deeply regretting the low tone about her peculiar character which many men of the most earnest piety have for the last 50 years maintained, may possibly have led you to identify me with them in points on which in fact we greatly differ. Excuse my entering on this matter, and let me once more thank you for your kind judgment of myself, expressed both in the proposal you have made me and in your mode of putting it. Believe me to remain most sincerely your's,

SAM^{L} WILBERFORCE.

On Sunday, February 18, he was in Oxford as the guest of Dr. Macbride, to preach his first University sermon,[4] which was on the parable of the Prodigal Son ; and, as usual, he used to the uttermost the opportunity of seeing and hearing others. His diary records his hearing sermons from J. H. Newman and from Mr. Hamilton, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, together with his criticisms on their matter and their style. Returning home through London he took the opportunity of hearing a debate in the House of Commons on the new Poor-Law, and had 'much talk with Smith, Gladstone, and Acland in the House.' Then with his brother Robert he 'dined at Mathison's,' and had 'long talk this morning [Feb. 21] with Mathison about schools.' This was the time when the subject of national education was beginning to occupy that prominent position which it has never since lost, and when

[4] Not his first sermon in the University pulpit, but his first sermon as select preacher before the University.

likewise it was being discovered that education meant something more than building school-rooms, or even filling them with scholars, and that the best of apparatus must prove nugatory, unless there were also teachers qualified for their work. It was in 1839 that Dr. Kay, afterwards Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, and Mr. Tuffnell on their own account set on foot at Battersea the first training-school for teachers, which in 1843 was taken over by the National Society, and is now known as St. John's Training College; and it was in 1841 that the National Society began its own training-school at Stanley Grove, Chelsea, for the purpose of giving a training which should bear a specifically Church character, and which has since been known as St Mark's College. To the large outlay necessary for this last-named work Mr. Mathison was a very large contributor, and to the end of his life took the warmest interest in its prosperity. At the date of the foregoing quotation from the diary, Mr. Mathison was an active member of the National Society's Committee. But at that time the plans of Churchmen went beyond what is called 'national' education and contemplated also the bringing of the lower middle-class schools into direct relation with the Church; and on January 11, 1838, Mr. S. Wilberforce wrote to his brother Robert:—

We have been again very busy at Winchester and I hope things promise well. It is of great moment, I think, not to make the terms of union strict as to middle schools at first. For, as they are now independent, they will not join us if we at first threaten them with very severe rules: whereas if we can draw them in, then by degrees we can get them to submit to all our plans for them. You remember Jeremy Taylor's beautiful sermon about marriage and how he says everything frightens the timorous beginnings of early wedlock, &c. This applies especially to books used, &c. It is very desirable that *ultimately* we should get the middle schools to as much uni-

formity as possible in the books they use ; but at present, all I think possible is to get them to send in the lists of those now used, for our inspection. New schools of course we can start with our books. On all such points as these I find that I and Keble are practically opposed at Winchester, and hitherto we have essentially modified his plans in spite of the Warden being his cypher.

The month of March, also, was mainly spent in London ; and in the following extract from the diary no one can fail to notice the latter portion of the entry under March 17, not merely for the quick sense of sympathy which it evinces, but still more for the illustration which it affords of one of the most characteristic of Bishop Wilberforce's peculiarities—that, namely, of an unsleeping alertness and observingness of mind, not merely in one direction, but, if such an expression may be allowed, in all directions at once, as if both the mental and the bodily senses were always turning every way, and could act on every side without confusion or interference :—

Saturday, March 17.—Morning. Wrote to Bp., whom heard from. Proposed review on Howitt's 'Rural Life,' for Lockhart. Then home. Struck exceedingly by *faces*,—history or prophecy in :—a poor woman especially in the street to-day—poor, sickly, and most distressed-looking,—suddenly lighted up with a face of *perfect pleasure*. I saw *she was carrying a baby which smiled*. Then she relapsed.

Sunday, March 18.—Morning to James Street to breakfast. Then in fly to Boone's (St. John's, Paddington) very pretty church. Sermon too much essay, some thought and one good hit—'chamber of licentiousness the ante-chamber of hell.' Back, read a little of Froude's 'Journals.' To Westminster Abbey, heard Lord J. Thynne. Met C. Anderson and E^{y} Anderson in the Abbey. Evening, to Melvill's, quite inferior to former times. 'Hear, O ye mountains,' &c. Yet some fine passages, especially near the end. The sinner testified against by Creation at the bar of Judgment. Home at 11.

Monday, 19.—Just as I was going to bed last night scalded my sound foot in attempting to foment the sprained. The pain at first agonizing, and having no dear wife to sympathize with me, it individualized me remarkably. The effect on my nerves so violent, rigor, shudderings, &c., that I sent for Surgeon Farquhar, who gave me opiate. A disturbed night with vivid and distressing dreams.

Fowler came express to tell me of Herbert's illness, &c., and I unable to go to him.

Confined wholly to bed until Friday; busy each morning doing the end of the 'Life.' Robert, and sometimes Henry, with me at nights. Many kind callers. C. Anderson with me 3 hours on Tuesday, James Stephen, Mrs. A. Smith, C. Dickenson.

Friday.—About a little in carriage. Sent off last sheets of the 'Life.'

Saturday, 24th.—About more. Called on Gladstone and Bp. of Chester. Book sale, &c., at Evans'. Then to Harley St., C. Dickenson's, his baby ill. Called at Erskine's and Dodsworth's. Again at Harley St. and baptized *Frances* Dickenson. Dined Mrs. Long's. Mrs. W. Long very friendly: too *vive*, and had all the faults of the low tone of the Peculiars strongly marked. Miss N. of the same school, but not the same *tone*, saved apparently by being actively employed in doing good. Miss Waldegrave—Church tone, and that intelligent. W. Long a good man, but a poor creature, evidently set up by Peculiarism. I opened very little, not seeing opportunities, but was on the watch. I think if I lived with such people much might be done, but merely saying a strong thing would alarm their best feelings and do them no good; they would only identify the sayer with a party and so escape the force. Defended Sibthorpe.

Sunday, March 25.—Morning, S. Stephen's, Walbrook. Dr. Croly, poor as to *usefulness* and *taste* and *reasoning:* some power of amplification. Subject, the Miracle of the Loaves. Chief thought, the *universal* need of food as an incentive to labour; and *supply* of God's goodness. Home. Sir H. Hardinge came in with Sir W. James and Lady E. H. Full of election comm^{ee}. How very injurious it must be to the mind

to have *no cooling days.* 'To be always *hot* and rusting with worldly cares: no pauses: no self-examination. I ought to thank God for my lot. If as it is I find it hard to make head against sin, what would it have been if I had been a successful lawyer?

Then to St. James'. Bp. of London on 'Thou hast known the Scriptures.' Very serious, good, and in parts touching; pressing on the rich the importance of giving their children a Scriptural education. He flings his head at you too much, otherwise VERY effective manner. As far as I have heard, I think he is the best preacher in his diocese.

Dinner, and then to Melvill's, on the Annunciation, equably good, except in one part, about the Conception. The beginning very good, about the danger of ultra-Protestantism, and—'a meek improvement of common opportunities.'

Evening, read a little of Froude's 'Journals.' They are most instructive to me, will exceedingly discredit Church principles, and show an *amazing* want of Christianity, so far. They are Henry Martyn *un*christianized.

Thursday, 27th.—Dined at Erskine's, a very pleasant party, George Babington and H. N. Coleridge. Much talk with him,—possession, &c.,—animal magnetism, &c.

On April 4 he completed his last corrections of his father's Life, which had been occupying him during these weeks in London; and then, on April 7, he returned to Brighstone, the 8th being Palm Sunday, and his diary specifies the celebration of Holy Communion each morning up to Good Friday, and a communicants' meeting on Easter-eve. But the manifold occupations of the month in town had been too much for him, and for the most part the next two months were months of ailing and of weakness, so that the notices in his diary are almost confined to the books which he was reading, —as, *e.g.* Chrysostom's 'Homilies,' 'St. Clement to the Corinthians,'—and to his preparation for his next Oxford University sermon, which appears to have engaged his mind and thoughts to a remarkable extent. Mr.

R. C. Trench is mentioned as visiting him for a few days, 'exceedingly pleasing, well-informed, and good. Much talk about *Mystics*, Schoolmen, &c.' And in answer to an inquiry from his brother Robert as to his opinion of Mr. J. H. Newman's recent work on Justification, he wrote the following letter, which defines his own theological position at this period of his life with much accuracy:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Brighstone Rectory, Thursday Evening [May 24], 1838.

My dearest Robert,— . . . . Newman's book I have not yet seen, and have not time to set to at it at present. I hardly dare write to you therefore on the subject of Justification; because, not having recently cleared my thoughts by the meditation consequent on reading such a book, I am not your match; but I will set down hastily my present view, which certainly differs much from yours, and seems much to agree with D. W.'s.

Scripture and the Church represent, I think, Faith as the formal instrument of our Justification. We are, that is, assured, on believing, that we are safe. So Abraham was justified, &c. You say—'By what Faith?' Not by the mere intellectual assent of the Solifidians, certainly not. You say—'What then?' 'Faith,' you reply, 'that works by love. Is not our salvation the result of works, &c.?' Surely not, I think.

Now, I should proceed thus. The *living* faith which is the formal cause of our Justification is a compound, an assent of the Understanding to the truth of what God reveals and a co-existing going forth of the Will approving of and choosing it. Now this is wholly independent of *good works*. Let time indeed be given and this principle will necessarily produce Good Works, but still by a *necessary accident*. It is not, I mean, the *future* production of Good Works which makes the difference between the one and the other, but the *present difference* of the Will. The man may die before he has had time to produce one Good Work, yet his living Faith

is not made to have been dead, by Christ. You show me two seeds: one is a dead seed, the other a living. I cannot see the difference; so I say, 'Plant them and then the living seed *will grow;*' but it is not this after growing which constitutes its life. It was just as much alive before it began to grow. The living principle within made it unlike the dead seed: only my infirmity prevented my being able to detect it. So in Faith. The living Faith, before the least possibility of working, is wholly different from the dead Faith, and God sees this; and the man, in whom it is, is freely and as much justified as if he had worked ever so much.

St. James, to confute Antinomians, argues that if it had been alive as pretended it must now have grown. He is using an *argumentum ad homines*, but God sees at once the difference, and a man usually himself suspects it. Now *I* think this is a most momentous difference in 1000 ways.

1st. To prevent boasting, as St. Paul uses it (Romans). In this first going forth of the Will we must recognize God's hand. We cannot pride ourselves on it. In the after works there is, from the nature of our minds, the greatest danger of our beginning to pride ourselves, and trust ourselves for our justification.

2ndly. To prevent despair, to timid conscientious minds:—'When shall I have worked enough to convince me I am justified?' What a question! Again for those who cannot work from circumstances, perhaps for all; for, until the sense of pardon comes from the free gift, I doubt if any *can* work. It is like a man trying to build under a shower of bullets piercing his hands. You see I meet your ἀπορία by denying that working by love is the differentia of a saving Faith. I say that saving Faith is the assent of the Understanding concurring with the choice of the Will; that this is visible at once to God, and by it the man is justified. To *man* indeed he can give no other proof that his Will has chosen, &c., than by acting afterwards accordingly; but this is only saying, man cannot be sure he was justified for his secret Faith unless he sees the outward fruits of Faith: because he cannot get at the *sap*, but must judge by the *fruit* whether the tree is healthy; yet the fruit, though a necessary *consequence of*, yet

is no inherent part in, the healthfulness of the sap. I have filled my sheet, so must end. With kindest love to Jane, ever your aff. brother,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

The rest of the year was a very busy period; and now that the laborious task of his father's biography was no longer making its constant demands upon his energies, he began to respond more freely to the increasing calls upon him as a preacher. On Trinity Sunday, June 10, and again on Sunday, November 25, he preached at Oxford, before the University; in each case preaching also, in the evening, at St. Peter's in the East, of which his friend, Mr. W. Kerr Hamilton,[5] was Vicar; and indeed for the whole period his diary is full of memoranda respecting the sermons which he preached, and the sums contributed for the objects, usually connected with Church missions, for which he pleaded. On November 26, occurs a memorandum of conversation with the Provost of Oriel on the question of his being proposed as Bampton lecturer—'he assents.' In June he and Mrs. S. Wilberforce spent some time at Winchester House, including the day of Queen Victoria's Coronation, June 28. Mrs. Wilberforce had a ticket for the North Transept; her husband and his brother Robert had places together elsewhere. The diary proceeds:—

Off by ¼ to 5. In Abbey by 5. Got first-rate places. A most gorgeous spectacle. *The* difficulty was getting away. Home by ½ past 7. After dinner with Bps. of London and Winton, πρωτοφίλοι, on roof to see the fireworks. Walked with Bishop to see illuminations.

It was during the time of this visit to the Bishop of Winchester that Dr. Hook delivered, at the Chapel

[5] Afterwards Bishop of Salisbury from 1854 to 1869.

Royal, the sermon on 'Hear the Church,' which has become historical, and is thus referred to:—

Sunday, 17.—Walked in the Square with Bps. of London and Winchester. London told us much of Hook's sermon that morning at Chapel Royal. He went with it, but thought it too much essay. Heard afterwards that the Queen was very angry at it.

On the same subject the Bishop of Winchester wrote to him afterwards, August 21:—

A propos:—Have you read Hook's sermon? I think there is no other mistake about it than that of calling it a *sermon*. In most respects it is excellent.

Of his reading at this period many incidental notices occur. Among others, Palmer's 'Ancient Liturgies' is mentioned; Mr. Gladstone's book, just published, on 'Church and State;' Carlyle's 'French Revolution;' St. Bernard's 'Sermons on the Nativity;' and, more than once, S. Chrysostom's 'Homilies.' His intimacy, too, with Mr. R. C. Trench was increasing; more than once he visited him at Curdridge, and such notices as these keep recurring in his diary—'Much talk with Trench: Mystics, &c. In even^g he read "Calderon,"' &c. And again, 'Instructive conversation with Trench.' And a little later on, October 25, he wrote to a friend:—

We have happily accomplished our visit to Trench. He is delightful, and it always does me good to visit him. He is full of thought, patient and laborious in study, and of a highly refined mind; a zealous Churchman, and yet a man of deep and earnest personal piety. There are few with whom I value personal intercourse more highly.

And again to his brother Robert he wrote the letter following, from which it is clear how much his conversations with Mr. Trench—'the Mystics, &c.'—influenced the current of his thoughts:—

Have you any books which will help me in an investigation into the rise, &c. of the school of the Mystics? I am planning to weave a web of this—its connexion with the Schoolmen, its maintenance of spiritual religion in the Romish bosom, glancing at the Evangelicals and their lower mysticism, putting Bernard of Clairvaux into a sort of foreground. It is only on monographs like this that in our profound ignorance we can hope, I think, to work successfully; and there are several features about that time capable of interesting delineation. But I want all sorts of books, and am so very low in money matters that I do not know where to turn for assistance.

Meanwhile his divergence from the views of the Oxford Tract writers in general, and those of Mr. J. H. Newman in particular, already frequently referred to, had become sufficiently marked for Mr. Newman to decline Mr. S. Wilberforce's further contributions to the 'British Critic,' of which he was the editor, which he did as follows:—

Rev. J. H. Newman to Rev. S. Wilberforce.

London, July 18, 1838.

My dear Wilberforce,—I felt the kindness of your offer, and certainly it seems like folly to hesitate about accepting it, considering who offers it; yet, on the whole, I think it best to do so. I have just got your letter, and feel that I ought to answer it at once, though I would rather do so in a less hurry.

To say frankly what I feel—I am not confident enough in your general approval of the body of opinions which Pusey and myself hold, to consider it advisable that we should co-operate very closely. The land is before us, and each in our own way may, through God's blessing, be useful; but a difference of view, which, whether you meant it or not, has shown itself to others in your sermons before the University, may show itself in your writings also; and, though I feel we ought to bear differences of opinion in matters of detail, and work together in spite of them, it does not seem to me possible at once to

oppose and to co-operate; and the less intentional your opposition to Pusey[6] on a late occasion, the more impracticable does co-operation appear.

While I feel, then, what I lose, and not the least on the particular subject you have selected, I think it best to conclude as I have expressed above. With kindest thoughts, I am, my dear Wilberforce, your's very truly,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

'Newman declines a review from me as not agreeing with him,' is all the entry on the subject in the diary for July 19.

Towards the end of the year he took an active part in the meetings in the Winchester Chapter Room, in connection with the education movement then beginning throughout the country; and likewise expressed decisive opinions as to the inexpediency of High Churchmen's holding aloof from the plan then mooted for erecting the 'Martyrs' Memorial' in Oxford. These and other matters will be sufficiently brought into view in the letters with which this account of the year 1838 may now be closed, and which are here given in the order of time:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to the Rev. Dr. Hook, Leeds.

Lavington, Petworth, Aug. 29, 1838.

My dear Friend,—I am truly obliged to you for the copy of your 'Hear the Church,' which you have so kindly sent to me. It would be a very superfluous thing in me to attempt to say how clearly, succinctly, and convincingly you have put forth your argument. Is there any truth in the newspaper statement that you are no more to offend the ears of royalty with such plain reasoning? I suppose that it is quite impossible that this should be true. I have wanted ever since I left London to thank you heartily for your kind exertions as to

[6] Referring to certain of Mr. S. Wilberforce's recent University Sermons. See *post*, page 141.

getting us Coronation tickets. Sir —— promised very well, but failed. We were, however, happy enough to get excellent tickets and be able to join thoroughly in the service. I looked in vain for you amongst the numbers who waited, as I did, for hours after its conclusion, for their carriages.

Will you give me any practical suggestions as to managing the Ranter section of a parish? When I took possession of my present living, 8 years ago, I found in it a Wesleyan meeting, which had been some seven years rooted. The *regular afternoon* service of the village was with them; not above 12 persons being present at the prayers of the Church. They had the only Sunday school. By God's blessing on various plans I succeeded in regaining them so far to an outward conformity that at 2 years' end the meeting was closed and the Wesleyans left the parish. But a body of *Ranters* soon crept in from a neighbouring parish. They pretended affection to the Church, laid hold of the strongest Wesleyan villagers, got to prayer-meetings in cottages, by degrees weaned them from the Church, threw off the mask, and made a schism, and now have run up a meeting-house. They have about 30 or 35 regular members (out of a population of 700), but have large attendances from curiosity, &c. &c. They touch none but the poorest and most ignorant. Their doctrine is Arminian —perfection, &c. Their arms, strong sensuous excitement, bodily perceptions of the presence of evil spirits, as well as of the Most Holy Spirit of God; their animosity to the Church extreme; their zeal for proselytizing unbounded; their apparent sanctity considerable; their real self-righteousness fatal.

Now, can you give me any practical hints as to managing such a set of evil ones, of reclaiming them, or at least of guarding a set of very ignorant people—whom reason scarcely touches, and who can be lighted up at once into a flame of what seems to them spiritual feeling by sensuous excitement —against such deceivers?

I am staying for 3 weeks here, at my wife's family's place (one of the loveliest in the South of England), with my brother-in-law, Henry Manning, whom you know at least by name—an admirable man, and a most sound and zealous Churchman, but, I grieve to say, in very weak health. Rose

has been near me, but I have not seen him. I called when he had sailed for Havre; but from the account given by his hosts I fear that the end of his earthly warfare must be fast approaching. We can ill, as we think, spare such men. Ever, my dear Friend, believe me to be most truly your's,

SAM^{L} WILBERFORCE.

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Mr. Charles Anderson.

Lavington, Aug. 31, 1838.

My dearest Charles,—I owe you a speedy answer to your last very kind and interesting letter. Your account of Lord F—— was very interesting. What a man the Church of Rome would have made of him! But there is the evil of our low notions of Church authority and Church discipline. Such men altogether escape us. They become wholly individualized and semi-dissenterized. Their energies are dissipated, and their private evil tendencies are exasperated instead of being softened down into the harmony of combined good.

As to my agreeing wholly with Newman, &c., Newman has just, very kindly towards me, but, as I think, very unwisely, declined receiving more articles from me in the 'British Critic,' 'because my sentiments do not sufficiently accord with those of Dr. Pusey and himself.' This is to me another mark of party spirit, which I greatly lament seeing among such great and good men. He knows well that I am a strong and dutiful Churchman, and to refuse contributions from such, because the *colour* of their opinions is not exactly the same as his, is to prefer party to truth, and to seek rather to attach to himself a body-guard of men than to disseminate through the existing Church a higher measure of Church sentiments. However, they are great and good men, and have great vocations, to which I wish that they would more wholly attach themselves.

I send you herewith a memorial to the Church Miss^{y} Society, which I am anxious to get well signed. The great object, I am sure, which we ought now to aim at in our missionary exertions is to give them a much more distinct Church character than we have done—to send out *The Church*, and

not merely *instructions about religion.* This is the way in which in primitive times the world was converted; and if episcopacy, a native clergy, a visible communion, the due administration of the Sacraments, Confirmation, &c. &c.—if these things be really important, then how can we expect full success till we send out missionary bishops, *i.e.* bishops and a missionary clergy as a visible Church?

Now this step is one preparatory measure by which we may work up to that; and if we can get up a strong memorial from lay and clerical *subscribers*, we shall force the Society, whose committee is very Low Church, to do something. What I want you to do is to get as many signatures of lay and clerical subscribers as you can, and then send them to me. I am collecting them from all quarters. As a layman you will be a doubly useful worker. . . .

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Easton, Nov. 29, 1838.

My dear[st] Robert,—I am very much obliged to you for the aff[e] letter I found ready to greet me at Oxford on Sat[y]. I will not repeat all the detail of facts given in my letter to ——, because you will read it there. I sat ½ an hour with Newman on Monday, and we had a little conversation. He did not allude to our correspondence, so I did not. He was what he has *always* been to me exactly, *i.e.* kind, and courteous, and *distant.* I never felt to know him the least, and I have my own solution for it, but too long for writing. I saw Hamilton, who is grown quite a sound Churchman. The proposal for putting up a Memorial to the martyred bishops now fills men's mouths. Some say it is a slap at Froude's 'Remains,' and so at Newman and Pusey. It is exceedingly desirable surely that they should turn aside such an imputation by at once subscribing, as the inscription (I will put in a prospectus, in case you have not seen it) is most entirely unobjectionable, *me judice.* Indeed I believe Pusey originally suggested part of it. Party division runs high at Oxford, and numbers are sent to Cambridge instead of Oxford, even by parents not Evangelicals, through fear of Popery, &c., *e.g.* some of the —— set

are so doing. This presses most heavily on Oriel, and Macbride told me the Provost felt from it that he could not, as once, choose the best to admit, but must take up such as he can get. Surely this is the necessary consequence of publishing such a book as Froude's. . . .

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Mr. Charles Anderson.

Brighstone Rectory, Dec. 7, 1838.

My dearest Charles,—I am quite vexed to have let so long a time pass by since I replied to your last very welcome letter; but in good truth every day has seemed too short for the work which has pressed for execution in it. A Confirmation with all its engagements in preparation and in progress has pressed upon me. Our Bishop was about a week in the house, and a very pleasant visit it was. Since that I have been again preaching at Oxford, not, I trust, without some fruit; and we are now very busy ordering a Diocesan Board for National Education after the notions of Acland, Wood, Gladstone, and all that party of young men who have been moving the subject in London. What are you doing about it in Lincolnshire? Or are you doing nothing? It is, I believe, a vital question for the Church. If the education of the country is to be taken from us, and they are to be stuffed with a smattering of science, and what not, instead of being taught their duty to GOD and to their neighbour in a plain old catechetical way, there can be but one end of it, and that must be the ruin of our land. I will not, however, say any more about this, as I send you herewith my Sermon on the subject, which I have just published at the request of the congregation at Portsea. Have you seen Dr. Hook's Visitation Sermon? I received it from him last night, and have as yet only just had time to dip into it. It seems to me, in that dip, to contain some important matter. I do not know what Newman will say to his notice of the 'Tracts for the Times.'

From Robert I hear good accounts about once a week. Henry Manning is gone to Rome for the winter; the Bishop of London wickedly says he thought he had been there ever since publishing his last volume of sermons. I saw Newman

at Oxford, as thin, as intellectual, as eager as ever. I saw Isaac Williams—just like himself—and the rest.

You have, I dare say, heard of the proposed Memorial to Ridley, Cranmer, and Latimer. I am very sorry that Newman and Pusey set themselves against it. It was just the opportunity they ought to have seized for doing away some of the evil of dear Froude's book; but they are bent on their own way. Things look dark with us, I think, as a people. Our navy is almost dismantled, and England has never prospered yet, when either wooden walls were neglected or Popery encouraged.

You sometimes like to be knowing by whom the articles in the 'British Critic' are, so I will mention them. On *our* 'Life,' Le Bas; on Trench and Monckton Milnes, F. Rogers; Animal Magnetism, Will[m] Sewell; Palmer's 'Book of the Church,' Newman; Palgrave's 'Truth and Fiction,' *James* Mozley; Sir W. Scott's Life, John Keble; The Canada Church, I know not. Ever your very affec[te] old friend,

SAM[L] WILBERFORCE.

On the same day, he wrote to Dr. Hook, in acknowledgment of the Sermon above mentioned, and the letter concludes as follows:—

I am just from Oxford, where I was called up to preach; and there have been joining my earnest advice to Ben Harrison's that Newman, &c. would add their names to this Memorial of the martyrs, just to prevent the tone of party-feeling with which the Memorial will assuredly otherwise become associated. It is not, I own, a cause which greatly kindles my feelings; but a small subscription from 2 or 3 of them would be well bestowed if it did but in the least check the ideas which some of Froude's expressions have excited in the minds of the better sort of men of a certain hue. I saw Hamilton alone for 2 or 3 hours, and had much interesting conversation with him. His Church views enlarge and clear themselves most hopefully.

With sincere desires that the blessings of the Advent season may wait on you and your's, believe me to remain most truly your's,

SAM[L] WILBERFORCE.

And lastly to the same, a few days after:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. Dr. Hook.

Brighstone Rectory, Dec. 26, 1838.

My dear Friend,—Though I thanked you on receiving it for the gift of your Visitation Sermon, yet I cannot content myself without telling you again, now that I have read it and the appendix through with care, how greatly I thank you for it. I think it is impossible for any one to read it with a tolerably candid mind and not get great benefit. The line you take is, I am convinced, the true one, and like all *truth* it is also expedient. I greatly regret that our good friends at Oxford will not occupy the same position, and strengthen our entrenchments with the names of our Anglican reformers, instead of churlishly noting every questionable statement which in such a seething time of thought and action could not but sometimes (in human agents) rise to the surface—and so giving them up as the most effectual engine of the Low Church battery on truly Catholic opinions. I had hoped to have persuaded some of them that there was now thrown in their way by this 'Martyrs' Memorial' an opportunity of showing, in some measure, a different state of feeling from that which Froude's 'Remains' exhibit—but in vain.

A Lincolnshire layman, my intimate friend (I may say to you, Charles Anderson, Sir Charles' son, of Lea) writes to me to-day, saying that 'Buckden Palace is to be sold, and I have heard that the Romanists want to purchase it. Could it not be made a collegiate school under some of the Colleges at Oxford?' Does any movement occur to you as feasible and to be desired in this matter? I hate such buildings getting into Roman hands. 'We see not our tokens'—must be the effect of many of such disturbances of old associations.

I hope you have received a sermon preached by me, and published at Portsea, which I sent you lately; and I should like to know if a copy of my brother-in-law's (H. E. Manning's) 'Rule of Faith,' which with a letter I sent you through a Home Office frank last summer, ever reached its destination. Believe me to remain very truly your's,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

So frequent has been the mention of Mr. S. Wilberforce's work in connection with his father's biography, that it will naturally be expected that the present chapter should not close without some reference to its publication. The book itself is so well known, especially in the form of its latest abridgment, that any criticism upon it would be entirely superfluous; but Samuel Wilberforce's letter to Mr. Gladstone, accompanying a presentation copy, will be read with interest :—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Mr. W. E. Gladstone.

Brighstone Rectory, April 20, 1838.

My dear Gladstone,—You will, I hope, accept as a pledge of friendly regard the copy of my father's Memoir which, at the desire of my brother and myself, Murray will send to you.

You will find, I trust, the part which concerns his old West Indian warfare written in a temper of which you will not disapprove; and the sketch which it gives of a public man holding fast to high principles, and living in the fear of God, will, I have no doubt, be interesting to you, and must, I think, be useful to those whose lot it is to be thrown into the midst of the same tempestuous scenes.

I have long wished to say a few words to you on your own position; from the one only reason which may have led me to see some things in it which may possibly have passed unnoticed by you, namely, that I know less and am therefore less occupied by its *details*, and may therefore think more of its general features.

It would be an affectation in you, which you are above, not to know that few young men have the weight you have in the House of Commons and are gaining rapidly throughout the country. Now I do not wish to urge you to consider this as a talent, for your use of which you must render an account, for so I know you do esteem it, but what I want to urge upon you is that you should calmly look far before you; see the degree of weight and influence to which you may fairly, if God spares your life and powers, look forward in future years, and thus act *now* with a view to *then*.

There is no height to which you may not fairly rise in this country. If it pleases God to spare us violent convulsions and the loss of our liberties, you may at a future day wield the whole government of this land; and if this should be so, of what extreme moment will your *past steps* then be to the real usefulness of your high station. If there has been any compromise of principle before, you will not then be able to rise above it; but if all your steps have been equal, you will not then be expected to descend below them. I say this to you in the sad conviction that almost all our public men act from the merest expediency; and that from this conventional standard it must be most difficult for one living and acting amongst them to keep himself clear; and yet from the conviction, too, that as yet you are wholly uncommitted to any low principles of thought or action. I would have you view yourself as one who may become the head of all the better feelings of this country, the maintainer of its Church and of its liberties, and who must now be fitting himself for this high vocation.

Suffer me to add, what I think my father's life so beautifully shows, that a deep and increasing personal religion must be the root of that firm and unwearied consistency in right, which I have ventured thus to press upon you.

May you in another walk, and in still higher opportunities of service, as perfectly illustrate the undoubted truth that those, who honour Him, He will honour. Believe me, my dear Gladstone, to remain most sincerely your's,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

Mr. Gladstone replied promptly, entering at some length into the public questions touched upon by Mr. Wilberforce. It was the time when Mr. Gladstone was busy writing his book on Church and State, and the letter might almost be described as an additional chapter to that work, or at least as a free application of its ideas and principles to the topics suggested by his correspondent. A few sentences, showing how dark at this moment were Mr. Gladstone's political

expectations, how curiously sanguine his ecclesiastical forecast, are here extracted :—

I fear entering on the subject to which you have given the chief part of your letter, because I know how large it is, and how oppressive, how all but intolerably oppressive, are the considerations with which it is connected. I have not to charge myself inwardly with having been used to look forward along the avenues of life rarely or neglectfully ; but rather with that weakness of faith, and that shrinking of the flesh, of which at every moment I am mournfully conscious, but most so when I attempt to estimate or conjecture our probable public destinies during the term to which our natural lives may extend—a prospect which I confess fills me with despondency and alarm.

Not that these feelings are unmixed : they are tempered even as regards the period of which I speak with the confident anticipations of new developments of religious power which have been forgotten in the day of insidious prosperity, and seem to be providentially reserved for the time of our need, for the swelling of Jordan ; and of course there lies beyond that period, for those who are appointed to it, a haven of perfect rest ; but still the coming years bear to my view an aspect of gloom for the country—not for the Church : she is the land of Goshen.

Looking, however, to the former, to the State as such, and to those who belong to it as citizens, I seem unable to discern resources bearing a just proportion to her dangers and necessities. While the art of politics from day to day embraces more and more vital questions, and enters into closer relations with the characters and therefore the destinies of men, there is, I fear, a falling away in the intellectual stature of the generation of men whose office it is to exercise that art for good. While public men are called by the exigencies of their position to do more and more, there seems to be in the accumulation of business, the bewildering multiplication of details, an indication of their probable capacity to do less and less. The principles of civil government have decayed amongst us as much, I suspect, as those which are ecclesiastical ; and one

does not see an equally ready or sure provision for their revival. One sees in actual existence the apparatus by which our institutions are to be threatened, and the very groundwork of the national character to be broken up; but upon the other hand, if we look around for the masses of principle, I mean of enlightened principle, blended with courage and devotion, which are the human means of resistance, *these* I feel have yet to be organised, almost to be created.

The biography of his father met with some rough handling, and the part which it assigned to Mr. Clarkson in the long struggle for slave emancipation was most vehemently challenged; but the spirit in which these hostile criticisms were met, appears from the next letter:—

Rev. S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Ryde, Sep. 24, 1838.

My dearest Robert,—I snatch a single moment, whilst I am waiting to see Lord Calthorpe, to scribble a line to you. . . . I have, since I heard from you, read through Clarkson and Crab. Robinson. My impression is *not* to answer it. If there were no such injunction as 'Let all bitterness and wrath, &c., be put away from you,' I should be for replying to it, for there are so many openings, that I am sure I could make an effective reply by cutting up Crab. Robinson severely, and Clarkson not a little. But without this it would not do to answer it at all. You can only do away the uncomfortable impression which it does tend to excite by a slashing rejoinder, w^h^ should engage in our behalf the reader's sympathy and carry the war well home into the enemy's country. As it is, therefore, I should let the matter rest, and answer it very succinctly in the preface to a new edition or to the 'Correspondence.'

I am going to sketch out a reply to the 'Christian Observer,' as you suggest. *Quære*, have I hardness enough not to be ground to powder between the Evangelical and Newman mills? Your's ever, *abruptissimè*,

SAM^L^ WILBERFORCE.

CHAPTER V.

(1839-40.)

LAST YEARS AT BRIGHSTONE.

MULTITUDE OF ENGAGEMENTS BEYOND HIS OWN PARISH — STRONG ATTACHMENT TO BRIGHSTONE—PUBLICATION OF UNIVERSITY SERMONS, OF 'EUCHARISTICA,' AND OF 'AGATHOS'—ACQUAINTANCE WITH BUNSEN, CARLYLE, AND MAURICE—THE STERLING CLUB—HIS S. P. G. TOUR IN DEVON AND CORNWALL—APPOINTED TO ARCHDEACONRY OF SURREY—LETTERS—PUBLISHES 'LETTER TO LORD BROUGHAM' ON THE EDUCATION QUESTION —GREAT SPEECH AT THE MANSION HOUSE FOR S. P. G.—ALSO AT THE ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING AT EXETER HALL—APPOINTED TO CANONRY IN WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL—APPOINTED TO RECTORY OF ALVERSTOKE—NOMINATED AS BAMPTON LECTURER FOR 1841—HIS PRIMARY CHARGE AS ARCHDEACON OF SURREY.

MR. S. WILBERFORCE'S powers were now ripening fast, and he was becoming known. Two years yet remained, during which he was to continue Rector of Brighstone, but already it would be a mistake to regard him as that and nothing more. Even during the year 1838, with which the last chapter closed, no small proportion of his time had been spent beyond the limits of 'the Island'—spent not in idleness, or in mere visits for rest or pleasure, but always in active work of some kind, in constant preaching, in attending meetings for Church purposes, or, if not engaged in definite work, then in that close and vigorous intercourse with men of mark, which perhaps more than anything else draws out and cultivates a young man's powers. Locomotion was a very different thing in 1838 from what it has since become; but there was one particular in which the constant journeying, which already was his habit,

had led him to anticipate the present custom of utilising the time spent in travelling by reading; and one who knew him well at that early period has often spoken of the bundle of books which was the companion of his long journeys by coach, and the amount of reading which he thus accomplished. Indeed, but for this habit, it would be difficult to account for the amount of knowledge, both of facts and of books, which he subsequently exhibited. An inspection of his diary shows that almost exactly one-third of the whole year 1838 was spent from home, and of this time little indeed was mere vacation. Some few days, it is true, might be so described; those, namely, during which he was at Lavington, where his brother-in-law, H. E. Manning, was now Rector; but all through the period in question his chief absences from home were spent in London, where Winchester House was his head-quarters; or at Oxford, or Farnham Castle, or at Winchester, or in preaching in various places in South Hampshire. And when he was at home the life at Brighstone was by no means the undisturbed and quiet life which is within the reach of a country clergyman, if he is so minded. It has been already observed that quite early in his Brighstone career he had become a central personage among the Island clergy; and during the period now spoken of nothing is more noticeable than the evidence furnished by his diaries to his social tendencies. It really seems as if he was never alone. Brighstone Rectory was never without guests. At one time it was his brother Robert from Burton Agnes, dearest and most cherished of all his kindred, who was staying with him for weeks together; or Henry from Bransgore with his wife; at another time the Ryders from Hanbury; or Mrs. Sargent and H. E. Manning. Periodically, too, notices

occur of visits from his Bishop and Mrs. Sumner, and from sons of his Bishop; and, not least of all, his wife's and his own most familiar friend, Louisa Noel, with many others who need no special mention. It was, indeed, the most cheerful of homes, brightened by his own unfailing cheerfulness, and by that of those whom he gathered round him, while the traces of the most cordial and continual intercourse with the clergy and laity of the Island are incessant. It is no wonder that under such circumstances his attachment to Brighstone was deep and strong, and that, before the Lavington property came into his possession, he had been anxious to invest his moderate capital in land in his immediate neighbourhood, so as to give him a territorial as well as a clerical connection with the locality. From this he had only been dissuaded by his older friends, who saw clearly enough that there was but little probability of his Isle of Wight career being life-long; but the circumstance is here mentioned as being highly characteristic of his disposition. No man was ever more devoted to his calling, first as a simple clergyman and afterwards as a bishop of the Church of God, than Samuel Wilberforce; but no man ever realised more thoroughly the fact that social institutions are a portion of the providential order of things, and that the spiritual and the so-called secular ought to be reciprocally strengthened and benefited by mutual connection and alliance. What was thus his intellectual conviction concurred also with his tastes and his disposition; and just as in later years he delighted to call himself 'a Sussex squire' as well as a Bishop, so at Brighstone he was desirous of becoming a landed proprietor as well as Rector. This being so it is still more illustrative of his pertinacious activity, not to say restlessness, of mind, that in spite of all these social tendencies, in

spite, too, of the ordinary duties of a parochial clergyman, he was never without some matter of literary work on hand. No sooner was his father's biography completed than now, in 1839, in concert with his brother Robert, he undertook the publication of a couple of volumes of his Correspondence;[1] and at the same time furnished a preface to the well-known 'Eucharistica,' first published in the spring of 1839 by the then Church publisher, Mr. Burns, of Portman Street. On January 23 he wrote to his brother Robert: 'I am just now very busy. I have engaged to write an introduction to, and revise, a set of Sacramental prayers, &c., which Burns is bringing out, and I find no great flow in this sort of thing. Send me any ideas which strike you. They are prayers, meditations, and doctrine, from Anglican Fathers of a good school. Then I have my Oxford sermon to prepare, and divers other little things in hand.' Of these 'divers other little things' his first volume of University Sermons,[2] published early in this year, was one. Another was his 'Agathos, and other Sunday Stories,' which he mentions in his diary as finished on May 17, having been written in the first instance for his own children; the apple-tree in the garden, under which the most part of it was written, is still pointed out.

Although thus included among the 'little things,' the volume of University Sermons just named was of considerable importance. In these sermons he delivered himself, and was understood to deliver himself, of a full statement of his mind upon matters then much debated in Oxford. He was already a striking preacher, eagerly listened to in the University church, and ready to seize the opportunity of expres-

[1] Published by Mr. John Murray. London, 1840.
[2] Published by Burns, 1839.

sing his sentiments. His leaning was always to the practical as opposed to the speculative side of theology, and he felt very strongly the practical danger of the unexplained sternness of the view of post-baptismal sin set forth in No. 67 of the 'Tracts for the Times.' This, of course, was an eminently practical subject, and three of the six sermons, of which the volume consists, were devoted to the subject of sin and its consequences, with a tacit but well-understood[3] reference to the teaching of the Tract above named. The titles of them are sufficient to show their drift. No. 1 was on the *moral* consequences of permitted sin; No. 2 on its *penal* consequences; and No. 4, practically a continuation of No. 1, on its *danger* as depraving the moral sense. The prefatory notice shows how thoroughly he was in earnest, and how anxious he was that his teaching should be fully grasped, and that his tenderness to the penitent should not be supposed to imply blindness to the evil effects of sin. He especially desires, he says,

that the first two should be read together,—the combination of the two views being an essential feature of Christ's Gospel, that whilst there is provided in it for every penitent a full assurance of His free forgiveness, and whilst it is his duty as well as his privilege to realise this truth and bring it clearly out as the spring of his future obedience, instead of doubting the assured mercy of his Heavenly Father, there is also in it a most clear declaration that indulged sin does deprave the moral nature, put a man back in his course, and so leave him after repentance, not, indeed, a whit less accepted of God, but with evil done to his own soul and ground actually lost, which repentance does not at once remove or regain, though it gives him a new opportunity of removing the one and regaining the other.

And the following passage on the connection

[3] See Mr. J. H. Newman's letter quoted above, page 125, declining further contributions from Mr. S. Wilberforce to the *British Critic*.

between moral evil and intellectual doubt seems almost like an anticipation of more than one sermon, which as Bishop of Oxford he delivered from the same pulpit in after years.

> In the natural course of things the heart which has been polluted by loose and evil living soon begins to doubt, and then goes on to disbelieve all that God has taught us concerning Him, and so it happens commonly that a licentious youth is followed by an unbelieving age; or, at best, that such an age is harassed and worn down by haunting doubts.

The year 1839 is noticeable also for a further loosening of the ties which had linked him to Mr. J. H. Newman and his school, even though his admiration for Mr. Newman's powers had suffered no diminution. Almost simultaneously with a complaint of 'Newman *flinging* at me in the "British Critic,"'[4] he has also entries in his diary, 'read a noble article of Newman's'[5] and 'read several of Newman's new vol. of sermons: their tone and standard magnificent, for holiness and separateness from the world, but I think too little evangelic.'[6] He was also 'reading Maurice' a good deal, hearing a 'beautiful sermon from Maurice at Guy's Hospital,'[7] meeting Carlyle, whom he describes as 'very interesting,' and also making an acquaintance with Chevalier Bunsen, which, as will presently be seen, ripened, not long after, into something more than an ordinary friendship. In March he was elected a member of the Sterling Club,[8] which

[4] Letter to R. I. Wilberforce, January 23, 1839.

[5] Diary, January 26, 1839.

[6] ,, January 27, 1839.

[7] ,, June 16, 1839.

[8] The Sterling Club was an association formed in 1838 as a dining Club, and for some months it existed without any distinctive name. Mr. Sterling, brother-in-law of Mr. F. D. Maurice, was a prominent member, and it is probable that he may have introduced the larger proportion of the original members;

brought him into association with many who could not be regarded as strictly orthodox, and which afterwards led to his being charged with views and opinions, the exact reverse of those for which he was customarily attacked. The fact is, that to a singular independence of judgment Samuel Wilberforce always united a peculiar inquisitiveness of mind, which was instantly attracted by any person who either had, or seemed to have, any special grasp of any positive truth or aspect of truth which was at all peculiar or striking. He was drawn instinctively to such men. Consciously or unconsciously he studied them, strove to assimilate whatever solid truth inspired them, and sought to fit it into his own scheme of opinion; and thus, perhaps, may have appeared to be for a time more influenced by them than he really was. But however this may have been, it is clear that at the period now under consideration Samuel Wilberforce, the High Churchman and favourite speaker at all kinds of meetings for Church purposes, was also not a little in the company of men of a very different school of opinion from his own. Of his per-

but even if so, this was not the reason for his name being given to the Club. The real reason was the *Pun* which lay in giving the Club a name, which was at once that of a leading member, and which also in some sort expressed the special character under which the members associated. For the only common link between them, besides that of mental culture, was a certain supposed genuineness of character, and freedom from conventionality. It followed of course that in such an association the most complete toleration of different opinions must be permitted. Thus Thomas Carlyle, John Stuart Mill, the Roman Catholic Charles Butler, Lord Ashburton, Thomas Acland, Lord Adare, and Alfred Tennyson, were with Sterling original members. Besides Mr. S. Wilberforce other members were the Bishop of St. David's (Dr. Thirlwall), Mr. Monckton Milnes, Lord Ebrington, Mr. Herman Merivale, Mr. Richard Cavendish, Mr. Blakesley (afterwards Dean of Lincoln), Mr. R. C. Trench, Mr. F. D. Maurice, Archdeacon Manning, J. C. Hare, and R. I. Wilberforce.

Long subsequently, in 1849, *after* the publication of Mr. Sterling's Biography had made known the sceptical tendencies of his later years, the Bishop of Oxford and other clerical members of the Club were bitterly attacked as though its name implied their concurrence in these later opinions of Mr. Sterling's; whereas, as above stated, the name was purely accidental.

sonal admiration for Bunsen in particular, something will appear in letters to be quoted in the sequel.

The major part of the year 1839 was spent in much the same manner as the preceding; and the general account of the engagements of the one may be taken as applying in the main to the other. But the latter portion of it was marked by an undertaking which brought him more prominently before the public than heretofore, and which must certainly have conduced not a little to his advancement. This was his long autumn tour in the counties of Devon and Cornwall, on behalf of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which occupied the interval from August 9 to October 18. Zeal on behalf of Missions was always one of his characteristics; and for several years before 1839 scarcely a fortnight passed by without a speech or sermon on behalf of one or other of the great Missionary Societies; but in the summer of 1838 Dr. Vowler Short, afterwards Bishop of St. Asaph, then Rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury, and a very active member of the standing committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, paid a brief visit to Mr. S. Wilberforce at Brighstone, in the course of a tour on which he was then engaged for the Society.[9]

[9] The following reminiscence of Dr. Short's visit to the Isle of Wight and to Mr. S. Wilberforce is striking.

In 1868 Bishop Wilberforce attended a very numerous and influential meeting, in aid of the Propagation Society, in North Wales, at which the Bishop of St. Asaph (Dr. Short) was in the chair, and delivered the opening address. In the course of his speech Bishop Short, holding in his hand a well-worn diary, said :—

'This day is full of interest to me. Thirty years ago, to the very day, I attended the first meeting ever held at Ryde in the Isle of Wight, on behalf of the Propagation Society. I was then Rector of Bloomsbury, and was hospitably entertained by a young Rural Dean in the Island, who also addressed the meeting at Ryde. I could not help saying to the friends around me, "that young man will make a figure in the world." And now, my friends, you shall judge of the truth of the prophecy, when I introduce to you that young man in the person of my very dear friend the Bishop of Oxford, and to whom I am now delighted to offer the hospitality which he then extended to me.'

It was during this visit that Mr. S. Wilberforce 'expressed a willingness to undertake something of the same species of work,' and early in 1839 Dr. Short made a definite proposal that he should 'travel for the S.P.G. for a month or two in the summer.'[1] A long correspondence followed, in which Dr. Short and Mr. Ernest Hawkins, then assistant secretary to the Society, went into the most exact details of the scheme, and the diocese of Exeter was selected as the sphere of work. Moreover, the Bishop of Exeter was to hold his triennial Visitation in the autumn of the year, and, with his Lordship's consent, the S.P.G. tour was arranged to coincide with the Visitation, so as to secure and facilitate his personal countenance and co-operation. All this was satisfactorily settled; not, however, without some misgivings on his Lordship's part, for the story is still told how, when it was proposed to him that a Wilberforce should make the tour of his diocese with him as a 'deputation,' he *screamed* at the idea of having to listen to the same speaker for weeks together. The Bishop screamed, but yielded, and when all was over he declared that whereas 'he had expected to be dreadfully bored, he had, on the contrary, been greatly instructed;' and in after days he used frequently to express his astonishment at the never-failing variety of Mr. S. Wilberforce's addresses and sermons.

Nothing was ever more carefully planned than this autumn tour. All the year through up to August it occupied his thoughts, and mentions of it recur incessantly in his diaries and letters. Again and again there are such entries as 'very busy sending off letters to the Devonshire clergy,' 'writing letters to Devonshire and getting up facts.' To his brother Robert he wrote, 'I had an interview with the Bish[p] of Exeter.

[1] Letter from Dr. Vowler Short to Mr. S. Wilberforce, January 10, 1839.

He is too civil by far to please me, with the "*delight with which he had read my sermon on the Temptation*,"[2] &c. But I hope to have a pleasant tour with him.'

The amount of work which he accomplished was very large. On August 11, the first Sunday of his tour, he preached three times, each time for three-quarters of an hour: first at Plymouth, then at Stonehouse, and in the evening at Devonport. On Monday he preached at Bickleigh, on Tuesday spoke for an hour and a half at a morning meeting at Plymouth, 'and D. G. very successfully; Bishop *too civil*,' and at an evening meeting at Devonport, after which 'with Archdeacon to Modbury at night.'

Wednesday, Aug. 14th.—Off directly after breakfast in rain, &c., to Kingsbridge. Small meeting, but successful. Formed association, &c. Then back to Modbury, do. there, and on to Mr. Yonge's.

Thursday, 15th.—Off in Mr. Yonge's carriage to Bickleigh. Breakfast at Mr. Walker's. Then to the church, to which, in time, came the Bishop. Service. I preached—easily. Very full church. Then to Mr. Walker's, and thence to Manistowe. Dinner of 80. Pleasant evening. I more and more like Archdeacon Froude, grow quite to love him. Two letters from my beloved Emily.

Friday, 16th.—Manistowe. Took leave of Archdeacon Froude and off (very wet) for Tavistock. Very striking drive. Dartmoor rocks and granite tors in clouds. On to Lifton. Party of clergy. Arranged for parochial associations. Evening preached to a most crowded congregation with interest.

Saturday, 17th.—Off to breakfast at Kelly. Then to Tavistock where —— and —— angry at not being enough consulted. Sir R. Lopes and meeting. Whitchurch to dinner. Then to evening meeting. Very much tired.

Sunday, 18th.—Drove in to Tavistock. Nervous, but preached 40 minutes without fatigue. Then to Milton

[2] This was Sermon No. V. in the volume of University Sermons mentioned *ante* (page 140).

Abbot. Preached with interest. People very attentive. Large collection. At night on to Lamerton.

Tuesday, 20th.—Wrote a great many business letters. Then to Liskeard. Meeting went off well. I spoke 1 hr. 20 minutes. Bishop very complimentary.

The foregoing summary of the first ten days' work must serve as a specimen of the notes of a tour which went on in the same way until October 19, and in the course of which he visited every town of any importance in the two counties, besides numerous smaller places. Among these may be mentioned, in order, Liskeard (a second time)—'beautiful passage of the Tamar at Newbridge;' Bodmin—'beautiful road by the side of the Fowey;' St. Austell, 'with Mr. Colenso,[3] of Harrow;' Fowey, 'with Colenso;' Lostwithiel, again 'with Colenso;' St. Columb, New Quay and Towan—'glorious sea, amethyst colour, and in full fury against trap rocks;' Truro, Redruth, Kenwyn, Perranzabuloe—'how wild and desolate a scene. Wind high, sea grand at Perranporth;' Illogan, Falmouth, St. Ives, Helston, Penzance—'a delicious excursion to the Lizard,—the Land's End most exquisite;' Marazion, Gwennap, Plympton, Ivy Bridge, Dartington, Paignton, Totnes, Brixham, Ashburton, Launceston, Camelford, Stratton, Okehampton, Barnstaple—'first lack of hospitality[4] since I left home; slept at the inn;' Ilfracombe—'breakfast with Chanter, Oriel man and nice fellow;' 'rode to Clovelly, which exquisite;' Linton, South Molton—'on by Dulverton with Archd. Barnes,

[3] Afterwards Bishop of Natal, then a master in Harrow School.

[4] And it should be added, the only such instance, as he was everywhere most cordially welcomed, the tour thus standing in marked contrast to John Wesley's tours in former days, referring to which a Cornish clergyman, the Rev. T. Grylls, of Cardynham, Bodmin, wrote to him: 'We shall be better off than old John Wesley was in this county about a hundred years ago, when he said he never saw a people more ready to hear preaching, or more backward to show hospitality.'

down the valley of the Exe to Tiverton;' Sidmouth, Exeter, Crediton, Honiton, Topsham, Torquay, Teignmouth, then a visit to the Earl of Devon, at Powderham Castle, then to Dawlish with Sir T. D. Acland, Exeter again—'grand meeting, and home with Sir T. Acland;' Newton Abbot, Axminster,—and then home to Brighstone, after a journey, as he is careful to specify in his diary, of nearly fifteen hundred miles, and which had occupied fully ten weeks of incessant speaking and preaching. Well might the Bishop of Exeter write to him, when all was over, to

express his earnest and heartfelt hopes that he was not the worse for his most extraordinary efforts. God grant that they may be blessed permanently. The present impression is very strong. With warm regard, your very faithful friend,

H. EXETER.

The mere pecuniary results of this work were large, the moral results enormous, more especially the stimulus which it gave to the work of the Society, not only in the region actually traversed, but throughout the country, as is abundantly evidenced by the mass of letters preserved alike from clergy in all parts, and from Mr. (afterwards Canon) Ernest Hawkins, who was then at the beginning of his long and energetic career in the service of the Propagation Society. From among the numerous letters from clergy in the diocese of Exeter, which show the strong personal impression Mr. S. Wilberforce had made, the following paragraph may be quoted as an example. It is taken from a letter written by the Rev. R. Luney, then curate of St. Andrew's, Plymouth, who, referring to a sermon he had recently preached on the Holy Communion, tells Mr. S. Wilberforce—

I thought myself justified in recommending your 'Eucharis-

tica' to my congregation in a sermon on the subject, and on the following Sunday was gratified by seeing certainly not less than a hundred and fifty copies in the hands of as many communicants. Many others could not obtain it, but the booksellers have ordered a fresh supply.

Reverting for one moment to the Bishop of Exeter's remark on the never-failing variety of Mr. S. Wilberforce's speeches and sermons during the tour in the West, and for which in after years his Confirmation Addresses were so remarkable, it may here be added that in this respect also his natural ability was not a little indebted to the early training of his eloquent father. One who knew him in 1839 thus writes:—

He was a guest at my father's house for many days. During that period I accompanied him to many different meetings on behalf of the Society in our county, and after having heard him speak day after day, sometimes twice or more in one day, on the same subject, I remarked to him my surprise at his language, so easy and so *varied* that I could not trace any sentences or phrases in the least similar, and although the subject was the same, his mode of treating it at each meeting was so different.

He replied that he owed his facility of speech mainly to the pains his father had taken with him that he might acquire the habit of speaking. His father used to cause him to make himself *well acquainted with a given subject*, and then speak on it, without notes, and trusting to the inspiration of the moment for suitable words. Thus his memory and his power of mentally arranging and dividing his subject were strengthened.

Most readers will recall the similar account given by Mr. Pitt of the way in which his father, the great Earl of Chatham, had trained him in his own boyhood, and will also remember that William Pitt was the familiar friend of Mr. Wilberforce.

It was during the course of this tour, of which even now, at the distance of forty years, the memory still survives in many quarters, that the death of Lord Walsingham caused a vacancy in the Archdeaconry of Surrey, and the entries in Mr. S. Wilberforce's diary record various conjectures as to the probable successor, especially Dr. Dealtry, then Rector of Clapham, and eventually appointed Archdeacon on Mr. S. Wilberforce's appointment to the Deanery of Westminster. The Bishop of Winchester gave himself ample time for consideration, and it was not until November 19 that Mr. S. Wilberforce met him by appointment at Farnham, received the offer of the Archdeaconry, and, having accepted it, was collated on the day following, and installed in Winchester Cathedral on November 25. The entries in his diary are here somewhat unusually brief, but they are to the point :—

Monday, Nov. 25.—To Winchester to be installed. Got there about *one.* At 3 installed by Dr. Williams. Solemn service. Silent prayer and offering.

Sat., Nov. 30.—Spent morning in prayer for a blessing on my new office, and meditation.

Friday, Dec. 6.—*Record's* remarks on appointment humbled and did me good.

The remainder of the year was not marked by any special occurrence, except that on Sunday, December 15, he preached his first Ordination sermon at Winchester Cathedral, which, at the Bishop's desire, was afterwards published.[5]

An extract or two from the letters of the period may here be added ; but, as may readily be imagined, its manifold occupations had largely interfered with his

[5] 'The Ministry of Reconciliation,' a sermon, &c., published by Burns: London, 1840. The sermon is remarkable for its repeated references to St. Augustine's sermons as examples of earnestness in evangelical teaching.

correspondence, and there are few years either before or after that now under consideration, of which so few of his letters have been preserved. On March 23, he wrote thus to his friend Mr. C. Anderson :—

Your account of yourself is good, and your Church Education Society very flourishing in its commencement. I most earnestly wish you would do something strong about this vile 4th Report. Surely above all things it becomes the diocese to act upon your Bishop, because if only you can act *on him* you act with double force upon the general question. Have you seen Sydney Smith's third letter to Archdeacon Singleton? It is really admirable. Though there are things in it one exceedingly regrets, yet for strong-headed sense as well as wit it is quite inimitable; and there is the great advantage in such writing, that those who would never listen to his arguments, if they were seriously put forth, now swallow them for the sake of the dressing.

We are getting on pretty well here with our Education plan, thanks to having a Cathedral to head us, and some efficient men. But the more one sees of the working of things, how the giving up of the Cathedrals (and the Report is really giving them up, for, if they are thus made 4 sinecures, they cannot long stand the pressure from without) is really giving up far more of the very being of the Church than any one would readily imagine. I believe it will be the 'beginning of the end,' as far as a National Church goes, if it is carried. Cannot you lay gentlemen speak more out? It is the moment of crisis. Now is the turning point.

It is very sad, my dear Charles, that we see so little of each other. I had some thoughts of coming to you, and I hope another year I may do it, but I have engaged to go through Cornwall and Devonshire for the Gospel Propagation Society this summer, and this tour will take all my time of absence up. Very affect^y^ your's,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

The reference in the foregoing letter is to the Fourth Report of the Commissioners for the considera-

tion of Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues. The Commission had been issued in the second year of King William IV., and its Fourth Report, dealing almost exclusively with the revenues of Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, had been made so far back as June 26, 1836. Various Bills based upon it had been introduced into Parliament, but this year was the first occasion on which such a Bill had reached a second reading, being supported not only by the Ministry, but by Sir R. Peel and the Conservative opposition. The Bill did not pass; and it was not until 1841, that the 'Cathedral Act,' by which, since that date, the Cathedral establishments have been regulated, was carried. Mr. S. Wilberforce's criticism in the foregoing letter hits exactly the chief blot both in the Report, and in the Act which was ultimately founded upon it. The diversion of so much of the Cathedral endowments, awkwardly as it was carried out, might be in some measure defended, but the recommendations of the Report were altogether deficient on the constructive side. They simply *reduced* the income and the *personnel* of the Chapters, and then dignified this reduction with the name of 'Reform;' without making the smallest suggestion for turning the great institutions thus 'reformed' to better account in the service of the Church for the future. The effect, then, of these recommendations was simply to reduce the number of Canons, in most cases to four, as stated in the letter, but to leave them practically sinecures, and thus, as Mr. Wilberforce intimated, almost to invite fresh criticism and attack. That Cathedrals have now become comparatively popular, and that so many members of their Chapters are among the most laborious of the clergy, is due, not to the provisions of the Cathedral Act, or to any wisdom of its framers, but to the fact

that care has been in so many cases taken to appoint men who only wish for work and have no mind to treat their position as a 'sinecure.'

On April 2, he wrote to his brother Robert with reference to a defence which Dr. Pusey had put forth of his Tract [6] on 'Sin after Baptism:'—

Have you seen Pusey's defence? I have read ½. I think some parts very good and effective, some remarkably unsatisfactory. That about Sin after Baptism, marvellous. That about Sacraments more than two, special pleading and quibbling, of which I could not have believed Pusey capable. Do tell me if you have read it, and what you think of it. I have time for nothing.

A letter to his friend Mr. R. Chenevix Trench, dated Winchester House, June 15, 1839, gives another illustration of the restless activity of his mind, and of his readiness to enter upon any fresh undertaking. Mr. Burns, the publisher, was now projecting the series of publications known as the Englishman's Library, to which Mr. S. Wilberforce engaged to contribute a History of the Church in America, and he referred to the scheme as follows:—

You have, I suppose, seen the advertisement of the 'Englishman's Library.' . . . . Will you contribute to it, and will you take the subject suggested in the accompanying note from Burns. As I am engaged to help, I shall not rest until I have got you into the same boat with me.

And the same letter thus speaks of Mr. F. D. Maurice and the Sterling Club:—

I saw Maurice for a while yesterday. He kindly called and sat with me. He gave me useful information on some points and charmed me with his benignity and wisdom. But the conversation did not flow. At the Sterling Club we had Sterling, Lord Adare, Lyttelton, O'Brien, Blakesley, Colvile,

[6] Tract No. 67 in the *Tracts for the Times.*

Spedding, Ellice, Heath, Pollock, Milner, Connop Thirlwall, Copley Fielding, &c. &c. It was an interesting evening on the whole. I thought there was a certain brusquerie about Sterling's manner, which took off from the pleasure of a first meeting. But many things spoke of substantial kindness. I hope that he has misconveyed himself to H. E. Manning; for Manning identifies him in some very painful points with the rationalism of Germany.

And the subjoined letter to the same was written the day after his collation to the Archdeaconry of Surrey :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. C. Trench.

Lavington, Nov. 21, 1839.

My dear Trench,—Your very kind note was forwarded to me here last week. I did not then answer it, because I had every reason to *expect*, from a note of my Bishop's, what I can now *tell* you, that he has collated me to the vacant Archdeaconry of Surrey, and I did not like to write without mentioning it, nor could I mention it. I went on Tuesday to Farnham and was yesterday admitted by the Bishop: next week I am to go to Winchester to be installed, the Archdeaconry being a 'Cathedral dignity,' although there is, as you know, no *stall* attached to it in the sense of a Prebend, though there is a stall in the choir in the sense of an appointed seat. The Bishop, however, proposes to bring in a Bill to alter the present endowment (which is objectionable on many grounds) for a Prebend in the Cathedral—the next which shall become vacant. This would, I hope, greatly facilitate our intercourse, one of the great *agrémens* of my present life. The position, I trust, is one in which I may be useful; but its responsibilities press at this time heavily upon me. I have asked 2 or 3 most intimate friends to make Saturday week, Nov. 30,[7] a day of special supplication for me in this my new post of duty. May I have the happiness of knowing that you will join yourself to them on that day as far as circumstances may make possible? You will let me hear.

[7] Compare this with the extract from diary of that date, given *ante* (page 150).

I knew you would follow with a friendly interest my tour in the West. It was in many respects very satisfactory, both in its results and in its conduct. I wish that you could have been with me in some most beautiful and grand scenes along the northern coast of Cornwall and Devon. It was by far the grandest union of a stormy and a clearly blue and transparent sea which I have ever seen. Most striking also were many of the moral scenes. The Wesleyan features: its (*sic*) conflict with heathenism and with the Church; its blessing and its curse are most remarkable. I hope that I shall see you soon, and have some conversation with you. I will return your 'Parables' shortly, very shortly. My sermons are selling well: 'Eucharistica' very well. I wish you had spoken of your reading, your thinkings, your *health*. Did Strathfieldsay profit you? Was the Duke of your weekly congregation? I heard not a very good account of your health from Miss Trower last week. Pray mention these subjects when you write to me, and ever believe me, my dear friend, to be most truly your's,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

To his friend Anderson he wrote thus:—

Lavington, Nov. 22, 1839.

My dearest Charles,—I do not like you to hear from another that I have been promoted by our Bishop to the Archdeaconry of Surrey, vacant by the death of Lord Walsingham. On Wednesday I was made Archdeacon. It seems very odd to be addressed by a new title, but this I suppose will in a few days become common to my ears and eyesight. The situation is one of great importance, and I trust that I may be enabled to be useful in it. I feel its responsibility pressing heavily upon me, and I have desired a few of my nearest and most intimate friends to aid me with especial prayers on Sat^{y} week, Nov. 30, that I may be enabled to do my duty right in this new sphere of service. I know, my dearest Charles, you will add yourself to the number; and I shall rejoice in thinking that you do. This appointment will not add anything at present to my income, because the pre-

sent endowment is to be altered, but it is to have the next vacant stall in Winchester Cathedral appended to it. . . .

I had a very interesting time in the West. I was able, thank God, to do a great deal for the Society, and I trust much permanent good besides. It is by no means impossible that I may undertake your district next year. If it was not for my Archdeaconry I certainly should. . . . Will you tell Mrs. Anderson that I beg to recommend, for your little Charlie, 'Agathos,' a little book, *2s. 6d.*, just published by Seeley, and which I think she will like? Believe me, my dearest Charles, to be ever most truly and aff^y^ your's,

SAM^L^ WILBERFORCE.

During January, 1840, Archdeacon Wilberforce was busily engaged upon an article which was intended for the 'Quarterly Review,' on the then condition of the Education question, but which, at the advice of Mr. Lockhart, and of Bishop Sumner, was published at once as a 'Letter to Lord Brougham,' in order to avoid the delay in its appearance which would have resulted, had he waited for publication in the April number of the Review.[8] This letter reached a second edition almost immediately. A letter to Dr. Hook, of this date, will give the best account of his occupations :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Rev. Dr. Hook.

Brighstone Rectory, Jan. 21, 1840.

My dear Friend,—I have to thank you, which I do very sincerely, for your admirable Manchester sermon. I trust that it will be very generally and extensively useful. I rejoice in your expressions in your note on the celibacy of the clergy. Perhaps, if I might venture to say it, your sermon just there hardly allows as much as your text implies: I mean where you complain that the charge of dis-

[8] 'A Letter to the Right Hon. Henry, Lord Brougham, on the Government Plan of Education.' Burns, 1840.

countenancing the marriage of the clergy is brought even against those who themselves are married. I confess I think that Pusey's language, 'a married priest,' is quite sufficient to account for the currency of such charges.

I hope you have received my Ordination sermon, and, from what I know of your opinions, I believe you will go along with me in my statements in it. If you have time to do so, I should be glad to know how far this is so.

I am just publishing, on strong advice, a letter to Lord Brougham on the Government Education scheme. I order Burns to send you a copy. If you can aid its circulation in Leeds, I shall be much obliged to you. The publication of small separate pamphlets, &c., except in your case, where they sell by the 10's of 1000's, becomes very costly.

There is also a small book which has sprung from my own nursery needs, which I want to commend to you. It is entitled 'Agathos, and other Sunday Stories,' price *2s. 6d.*, and is an attempt to combine the instruction and amusement of children with the instilling of Church principles. The stories in it were first told to my own children. It is a sort of book much wanted, and I hope that you would think it in some measure supplies the want.

Confidential.—A few days since an old pupil of my brother Robert's, in the neighbourhood of Huddersfield, wrote to him to express his anxiety that that living should be got for my brother Henry, and to ask if he would take it. His answer was, he believed that he would if the offer came, but that he was sure he would do nothing towards inviting it. He knows nothing of this. Lord Zetland and Mr. Dundas are patrons for Sir J. Ramsden, who is a minor. Do you know anything of the living, or of its probable disposition? Seventy thousand souls are an overwhelming charge. Ever, my dear friend, believe me to be most truly your's,

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE.

On the day following the date of the foregoing, his third son, Ernest Roland, now Canon of Winchester, was born.

During this month, also, he began the favourite allegory, 'The Rocky Island,' and likewise became a member of the Athenæum Club, being 'unanimously elected as one of the privileged nine, Mr. Stephenson, the engineer, being the only other person honor'd with that distinction at present,' as his friend Sir T. D. Acland wrote to him on January 28. Then, as the year advanced, he was less at home; and his diary becomes a simple chronicle of meetings or committees attended, speeches or sermons delivered, and visits paid or received, interspersed here and there with notices of an occasional day's work, and not seldom a *night's* work after a busy day was over, at his now forthcoming 'History of the American Church.' One of the meetings thus referred to was of sufficient importance to deserve a separate mention, as it was the occasion of his first appearance as a public speaker in London. The period which we have now reached was that when the great expansion in the operations of the Propagation Society was commencing,[9] and with a view to make its claims and its work better known, a large meeting was arranged to take place in the Egyptian Hall of the Mansion House, on April 8, with the Lord Mayor in the chair, supported by the Archbishops and a large number of the Bishops. Fresh from the successes of his tour in Devon and Cornwall in the preceding autumn, it was only natural that Archdeacon Wilberforce should be asked to take a leading part in the proceedings of the day; and numerous as in after times were his platform speeches, and unrivalled as was his success as a public speaker, it has always been asserted that this, his first great ap-

[9] The famous 'Letter' of the Bishop of London (Blomfield) to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which preceded the formation of 'The Colonial Bishoprics Fund,' was published on April 14, 1840—a few days after the meeting mentioned in the text.

pearance in London, was at least as striking as any that followed it. His voice and manner had reached their full perfection, his materials had been thoroughly prepared and arranged, and the effect of his profound fervour was heightened rather than diminished by a youthfulness of appearance, which would have made it difficult for one who did not know him to believe that he was more than thirty, and which set him in the more marked contrast with the grave and reverend Bishops who sat around him. From that day it may fairly be said that his reputation as a public speaker was established. The occasion was thus referred to in his letters. On March 24 he wrote to his brother Robert :—

I have just got a hateful business: a letter from Bp. of London in name of Archbishop of Canterbury, requesting me to take a resolution at a public meeting for S. P. G., to be held in Egyptian Hall, April 8th, Wednesday, Lord Mayor in chair, on requisition of between 3 and 400 leading bankers, merchants, &c. The 2 Archbishops and all London are to be there. It is most absurd having me. I cannot speak without facts and a position, and there I shall have none. However, I have clearly no choice, as it has come unsought, so I have assented. It would be some refreshment if I thought you would be in town. I mean to go to my Bishop's on Tuesday, and return here on Friday, if I get over the Wednesday. My further plans are to come to my Bishop's with Emily for 3 or 4 weeks on the 25th April. I have work in the Archdeaconry for several Sundays, charity sermons, &c., to preach, and must go to do it. The Ch. Miss. Soc. have just offered to endow a bishopric with 1,000*l.* a year pay, and land hereafter, if Bp. of London will consecrate, for New Zealand. This is a great beginning.

And again to the same, on April 1 :—

I want you to jot down for me the simple *facts* of what my father did do about sending the first chaplain. &c., to Aus-

tralia. I believe I have it all before me, but I much want your information. If you can do this *at once*, I shall be particularly obliged to you, as I think it may be very useful, and no one can say what may turn up, or what opportunity I may have (if I am *quite* certain of my facts) of making them truly and effectually known.

And two days after the meeting :—

Our meeting went off very well. It appears I gave satisfaction to all but myself. I spoke not nearly so well as in the West, and infinitely below my own perceptions of excellence. Yet I trust it answered its purpose in stirring up the meeting. The Bp. of London spoke most kindly to me about my speech yesterday and to-day, only saying, 'I do not quite like hearing you, for you make me cry.' Our Bishop said, 'You spoke admirably.' Dearest R., I do not tell you this with a feeling of vanity. I am sure I do not, but because I know you, from affection, will wish to know *just all*. I greatly fell below my own standard, and the opinion of others somehow does not alter that.

A second striking public appearance of Archdeacon S. Wilberforce took place during this year. It was on June 1, on the occasion of the great anti-slavery meeting held at Exeter Hall to inaugurate the ill-fated Niger expedition under Captain Trotter, when Prince Albert made his first public speech in this country, and which stands first in the volume of his Speeches and Addresses, published by Mr. Murray in 1864.

One who was present writes :—

The Prince Consort agreed to preside, and some of the chief men of the country were present. It turned out, however, a slow affair, the speeches dull and wearisome, when on a sudden a young man got up to move a resolution, and he spoke so much to the purpose and with so much fire in manner and originality of matter that the eyes of all were turned upon him, and thunders of applause arose when he sat down. The Prince enquired his name, it was Samuel Wil-

berforce. Sir Robert Peel, in a following speech, complimented him as his father's worthy son; and he was altogether the hero of the day.

It is somewhat remarkable that the only notice of this in his diary is comprised in the words: 'June 1.—Anti-slavery meeting,' and that no reference to it occurs in his letters; but it may be mentioned that when, six months later, the Archdeacon was nominated one of Prince Albert's chaplains, the incident was thus referred to at the close of the letter offering him the appointment.

> The Prince has additional pleasure in making this proposition to you, in looking back to the great meeting at which he presided and at which your talents so ably advocated the cause of humanity and religion.

In August the Canonry in Winchester Cathedral, with which the Archdeaconry of Surrey was to be endowed, became vacant, and on the 13th he was collated, and installed as Canon of the Cathedral, in which nearly thirty years after (1869) he was to be enthroned as Bishop. In September and October he delivered his primary charge as Archdeacon of Surrey, at St. Olave's, Southwark, at Epsom, and at Guildford; and on October 29, after two or three days' consideration, he accepted his Bishop's offer of the important Rectory of Alverstoke, to which he was inducted, December 4, thus severing a connection with Brighstone and the Isle of Wight which had lasted for ten years and three months—a period to which he always looked back as one of the most unclouded happiness. The appointment was thus announced to his brother Robert:—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. I. Wilberforce.

Farnham Castle, Oct. 27, 1840.

My dearest Robert,—You must hear from no one but myself that my Bishop has called me to undertake the charge of the living of Alverstoke, which has just fallen vacant. Many

things make my heart sink at undertaking this great and important charge. But my Bishop's view is quite clear that it is my duty to do so; and I cannot hesitate to consider this as an intimation of God's will, and therefore shall go there with a good heart, trusting in His aid. Pray for me, my dearest brother.

My income will be increased about 400*l.* per annum by this change, and my ministry will be brought to bear upon a much more educated as well as numerous class. I shall also be at the head of the Gosport and Forton clergy. In short, here is a great opening for usefulness, if it please God to give me a single eye, a zealous heart, and a clear head. Write me a few lines soon. I am going a week of Surrey work, having left Emily at Lavington. M'Call succeeds me at Brighstone.

One only circumstance connected with the year 1840 remains to be mentioned, namely, that in May he had been appointed by the Heads of Houses in Oxford to preach the Bampton Lectures for 1841, on which he writes to his brother Robert: 'I have trembled and assented. I shall want your help. I hope it may fix me to a year's hard reading of theology.' The year's hard reading never came, and though during the first two months of 1841 he was working steadily at them, and made some progress in their composition, the lectures were never preached, owing to the death of his wife, which took place shortly before the time when otherwise they would have been delivered. It is somewhat singular that no mention can be found of their proposed subject; though it is said to have been the Personality of the Holy Ghost. On Sunday, December 20, he preached his farewell sermons at Brighstone, and the last days of the year found him at Alverstoke, the temporary guest of Gen. Burrows, one of his new parishioners, and whose son, the Rev. H. W. Burrows,[1] now Vicar of Edmonton, having been for a

[1] How highly Bishop Wilberforce appreciated Mr. Burrows' help is shown by

few months his curate at Brighstone, accompanied him to his new charge in the same capacity. Not an hour was lost in getting to work, and in his diary for December 30, we read :—

Walked all over the parish with —— and ——. Poor-house : 1st time administered Eucharist in infirmary : affecting sight : about plan of chapel.

Within a few days of his own induction as Rector of Alverstoke, his brother-in-law, H. E. Manning, became Archdeacon of Chichester.

It has been already stated that Archdeacon Wilberforce held his primary visitation in the months of September and October of 1840. Unlike the majority of such productions, his Primary Charge went through two editions before the close of the year—a circumstance due partly no doubt to the general attention already attracted to the writer, but not a little also to its own intrinsic merits. The now familiar features of the remarkable series of his subsequent Episcopal Charges appear in this his first official utterance ; and, were there no other interest attaching to it, it repays perusal even at the present day, as a general survey of the state of the Church, and of the Church movements of the time. But there is an additional reason why a faithful biographer of Bishop Wilberforce should pause a while to recall attention to this first official utterance of his earlier days. It is, as has just been said, peculiarly full and comprehensive in its range, and surveys the whole field of the Church work and the Church questions of the hour. It is also thoroughly outspoken, and its words read like those of a man who, having silently accumulated many and strong convictions, and then

his words in a letter of 1845 to Mr. Gladstone :—'My late curate at Alverstoke, Henry Burrows, Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, is one of the best men and Churchmen I ever met with. I owe more to H. Burrows for devoted faithful attention to the service of the Church at Alverstoke than I can ever repay.'

suddenly found opportunity of utterance, pours forth all that is in his heart without stint and without restraint. Samuel Wilberforce was a man whom some accused of a change of views and of professions according as his circumstances altered. No charge could be more false, and yet such accusations are often more easily alleged than refuted. It is therefore especially incumbent on his biographer to call attention to a document like this, which sets in so striking a light the absolute identity, as regards all their main outlines, of his later views and opinions with those which he so strikingly expressed at the comparatively early age of thirty-five.

After opening with a brief but careful account of the history and nature of the Archidiaconal office, he proceeds with a characteristic call to unity and to the manifestation of that unity by active co-operation :—

> In union must be our strength ; and between men engaged in action there cannot long be union without concert. Perhaps one of the main causes of want of strength within the Church of England, at this time, is the want of concert, combination, and therefore of strict union between her clergy. We act separately in our parishes—we grow to act as units on society ; the man, therefore, and not the system, is brought to bear upon the various hindrances we meet with. Meanwhile, the necessary love of our own plans—peculiar modes of viewing truth—the apparently paramount importance of that part of the truth which we are most apt to contemplate—all this tends to develop a selfish standard, to lower our estimate of unity, and to sever us from our brethren. Then come suspicious thoughts of all who do but express the same truth in different modes of speech ; then shyness of combined action, which is soon observed, imitated, and exaggerated by our flocks ; and so the compact phalanx of the Church, which in her union would be terrible as an army with banners, is broken up into a mixed and disordered multitude, and is in danger of becoming the helpless prey of the first vigorous and combined assault of her beleaguering enemies.

After this the revival of Rural Synods, which had just been commenced in the neighbouring diocese of Chichester, under the short but very active episcopate of Bishop Otter, as well as in the diocese of Salisbury, is touched on and recommended. Eight or ten pages are given to the church-rate question.[2] The Cathedral Act comes next, and, small as was the approbation which the speaker could measure out to it, still his counsels were eminently practical, and, not only so, but eminently thorough.

Now that it is settled, we can have but one object; and that is, to lessen the evils and secure the advantages of the new system on which we are entered. The first step to this is to let all difference of feeling die away with the division of judgment from which it sprung. And this we cannot do unless we are ready to give ample credit to the pure and single motives of those with whom these measures had their origin. Nor can any one reasonably doubt that an earnest zeal for the spread of true religion and the welfare of the Church of Christ amongst us animated the two distinguished prelates who have throughout stood foremost in this cause; whilst other circumstances[3] have clearly shown that amidst all the perplexities of office the aim of the eminent Minister under whom the Commission was begun pointed no less singly to the strengthening of the Church.

[2] The Archdeacon quoted the words of Baron Gurney in a recent church-rate decision, which may be worth recalling :—

'Till within the last ten years no man living had ever heard of conscientious scruples upon this subject from any class of Dissenters. I respect the rights of Dissenters—no man more so; but I feel great distress when I hear *conscience* prostituted by an admixture of political feeling. If a man purchases a house, he gives a price, subject to all burdens upon it, and he calculates that he shall have to pay certain rates and taxes, and in proportion to that, so does he estimate its value; and I have never heard that any one of these persons has ever paid over to his landlord any sum he may have saved in consequence of any tax; and until any man had done that, the less he said about his conscience the better.'

[3] The reference here is to a long and elaborate letter from Sir R. Peel written some years previously, *i.e.* in February 1835, to the Bishop of Durham on the expediency of applying some portion of the Cathedral endowments to parochial purposes. This letter had only recently been made public when the Archdeacon's Charge was delivered.

Other topics of the Charge were the recent Act of Parliament allowing, under certain conditions, clergymen of Scottish or American ordination to officiate in English churches—an Act which, he said, would 'be hailed with no little pleasure by every one who values highly the maintenance by our Church of her true Catholic character;'—the then recent formation of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund, from which such vast results have accrued; the importance of establishing parochial associations in connection with the Propagation Society; and, last not least, the state of the education movement. On this last head the Archdeacon spoke at some length, detailing at once the nature of the proposals of the Government, and the steps taken on the part of the Church, especially the formation of training-schools for teachers in the Winchester diocese and elsewhere, and the general establishment of Diocesan Boards of Education,[4] which 'promise under God's blessing the greatest results.' The Archdeacon concluded with a reference to the divided condition of the several classes of society, and a powerful statement of the office of the Church in harmonising and knitting together the component parts of the nation.

Such was Archdeacon Wilberforce's first Charge, which even at this distance of time cannot be read without interest, and which, as was said above, passed through two editions in less than three months. But though this clearly shows the prominent position which, at the early age of thirty-five, he had already attained, it must not be supposed that in his case, any more than with other men, distinguished powers could be exercised without incurring corresponding de-

[4] Nearly all the Diocesan Boards of Education, to the action of which the Diocesan Training Colleges for Teachers, and the present system of Inspection of Schools in respect of religious training, are so largely due, were formed during the years 1838–40.

traction, and the charge of 'Tractarianism' was even now freely brought against him.

Perhaps no more fitting termination can be given to this chapter than the subjoined letter of condolence with his friend Mr. R. C. Trench, then suffering under the loss of a dearly loved and promising child. Few men, if any, have been of quicker or keener sympathies than Samuel Wilberforce; none have been gifted with readier tact or happier art in expressing those sympathies, or in the adaptation of such expression to the special temperament and character of those whose sorrow he sought to assuage. The number and the variety of his letters of condolence which have been preserved is almost infinite, and this, the earliest specimen of them all, may serve as an example:—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. C. Trench.

Rectory, Sunday [1840].

My dearest Friend,—My heart is full, and yet I know not how to speak to you. This blow has seemed at last to come (as it always does) so suddenly. I had but just risen from my knees from praying for you and Mrs. Trench and the little one, when your messenger knocked at the door, and brought your note telling me that she was beyond our prayers, and had entered after this brief and outward struggle upon the rest which HE bought for her Who lay in the manger at Bethlehem. May God be with you, my dear friends, in this hour of trial. How well do I know its still palsying weight, when the ministries of love can tend no longer the sinking sufferer, and prove an outlet for the flood within our own heart. And He will be, He is, with you. He who rose Himself 'very early' in this morning from the bands of death hath visited your house and taken out of your bosom, but still *from* death even though *through* death, one of His purchased. You have another child *safe*, another in Paradise, another who can never sin more, who shall never more 'go out,' of whom your heavy heart shall never more ask what may be

God's secret purpose, who shall receive you one day into your own abiding-place.

I need not say how deeply Mrs. Sargent sympathizes with you. She will soon be with you; and after the second church, at farthest, you will let me come to you. Ever, my dearest Trench, believe me to be your ever affectionate

S. WILBERFORCE.

CHAPTER VI.

(Jan. 1841—Oct. 1844.)

ALVERSTOKE.

ACCOUNT OF ALVERSTOKE AT TIME OF ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE'S APPOINTMENT—HIS WORK THERE—APPOINTED CHAPLAIN TO PRINCE ALBERT—DEATH OF HIS WIFE—ITS LASTING EFFECTS UPON HIS MIND—EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS AND DIARIES RESPECTING IT—CONTEST FOR POETRY PROFESSORSHIP AT OXFORD—LETTERS—THE JERUSALEM BISHOPRIC—THE ANTI-CORN LAW LEAGUE—LETTERS—FIRST SERMON BEFORE THE QUEEN—LETTERS—FREQUENT PREACHING BEFORE THE QUEEN—EXTRACTS FROM LADY LYTTELTON'S LETTERS DESCRIBING THE IMPRESSION WHICH HE MADE AT COURT—APPOINTMENT OF MR. H. W. WILBERFORCE TO VICARAGE OF EAST FARLEIGH—CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. HOOK ON NATIONAL EDUCATION AND CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT—LETTERS TO ARCHDEACON R. I. WILBERFORCE ON CHURCH DISCIPLINE AND THE CHARACTER OF TRACTARIAN TEACHING—LETTER OF REPROOF TO A FRIEND—VOTE AT OXFORD ON THE ELECTION OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR—APPOINTED SUB-ALMONER TO THE QUEEN—ENGAGEMENTS WHEN IN LONDON—ATTENDANCE AT THE MEETING OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION AT YORK—PUBLICATION OF 'HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH'—LETTER FROM MR. GLADSTONE RESPECTING IT—INCIDENTS OF A JOURNEY TO OSBORNE ON A SUDDEN SUMMONS TO PREACH BEFORE THE QUEEN.

THE parish of Alverstoke, of which Archdeacon Wilberforce was now Rector, was originally a large agricultural district,[1] but had long included Gosport, one of the few fortified towns in England, with its suburbs of Forton, Brockhurst, Elson, and Hardway. Of late, too, a new watering-place had grown up, with the name of Anglesey-ville imposed upon it, instead of its more natural one of Stokes Bay. In the parish were

[1] Acres 4,000. The population, in 1841, was 13,510, including 204 seamen in Haslar Hospital. For most of the particulars respecting Archdeacon Wilberforce's incumbency of Alverstoke, the writer is indebted to the Rev. H. Burrows.

several naval and military establishments, forts, barracks, the Naval Hospital at Haslar, and the Royal Clarence Victualling Yard ; and in Gosport there were many low public-houses and dens of vice. There were only two churches (Alverstoke and Forton) with cure of souls attached to them. The chapel at Gosport had no legal district, and the whole parish had, from a Church point of view, laboured under great disadvantages, while Dissent in the early part of the century had been particularly well represented by the eminent Dr. Bogue, who, with his young aspirants to the Dissenting ministry, had been very influential, and in a position to compassionate the adherents of the richly endowed but ill-served Establishment. There had, indeed, been a revival of religion among Church people at Gosport through the Evangelical ministry of the Rev. Richard Bingham, jun., but his influence was waning when Samuel Wilberforce appeared on the scene. There had also been an earnest Evangelical clergyman, Mr. Dewdney, at St. John's, Portsea ; but otherwise there was much deadness; and Archdeacon Wilberforce was soon felt to be the stirring spirit and master-mind of the neighbourhood, capable of attracting to himself whatever was zealous or intellectual in 'the three towns' of Portsmouth, Portsea, and Gosport.

The church at Alverstoke was more humble then than it appears now, since it has been enriched, through the present Rector, the Rev. T. Walpole, with a good chancel. Archdeacon Wilberforce had to endure its meanness, for the double reason that it had been, just before his time, in a way rebuilt, and that other needs called still more imperatively for his exertions. He soon altered the internal arrangements of his church, so as to bring the font out of a corner and place it where the baptisms could be performed in the face of the con-

gregation, as they soon were, one Sunday in each month during the afternoon service. Daily prayers were introduced at 8 A.M., except on Wednesdays and Fridays, when they were at 11 A.M. At the Wednesday service the children of the schools, and those of the higher classes, were catechized together, as also on Sunday afternoons. On Thursdays there was an evening service at 6.30 P.M., and also on Saturdays whenever Holy Communion was to be celebrated the next day. On Sundays, in addition to the 10.30 A.M. and 3 P.M. services which he found, he established an evening service at 6.30. On the first Sunday of the month, Holy Communion was celebrated at mid-day at Alverstoke, on the second Sunday at St. Mark's, Anglesey, and on the third Sunday at Alverstoke, at 8 A.M. The church at Anglesey had been begun by his predecessor at the instance, and mainly through the liberality, of the originator of Anglesey-ville, Mr. Robert Cruickshank.

The parish church at Alverstoke, humble as it then was, soon attracted crowded congregations, including, especially on Sunday afternoons, many naval officers from ships in commission, and from the Naval College at Portsmouth. His sermons during his incumbency at Alverstoke were probably some of the best he ever preached, for which three reasons may be given: (1) after ministering for years to a little country congregation, he was now for the first time in a sphere which roused his energies; (2) his sermons, in contrast to those which he afterwards delivered to strangers on special occasions, were at this time addressed to persons with whose circumstances he was acquainted, and whose progress he could watch; and (3) his own feelings were quickened and his own religious life profoundly stirred by the sorrow in his own home, which will presently be dwelt upon—the death of his

wife, which took place at Winchester just before his moving into the Rectory at Alverstoke.

From his parish he was necessarily withdrawn at times by the duties of his Archdeaconry, by residence as Canon of Winchester, and by frequent summonses to Court, where he preached for the first time September 26, 1841; but no absence ever caused him to lose the thread of his pastoral work, and during his short incumbency he managed to get built national schools at Alverstoke, a church at Elson (St. Thomas'), and a church at Gosport (St. Matthew's), with large national schools intended to serve for the whole poor population of Gosport. A house of industry, or parish workhouse, was also the scene of much earnest labour, and district visiting was organised, a little record of which remains in a short tract drawn up at the time, and published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

At one time the whole pastoral visitation of the town of Gosport was thrown upon himself and his curates, and a room was taken in a low part of the town to serve as an office for the Alverstoke clergy. With his curates he lived on very intimate terms, uniting with them in prayer at stated times for a blessing on their ordinary work, and in special supplication in cases of difficulty, guiding their studies also, and reading with them both English and Patristic theology. Into the Confirmation of 1844 he threw himself with peculiar heartiness, drawing up each week with his curates notes of lectures given to the candidates, which have been much copied in manuscript, but unfortunately were never prepared for publication. In such matters as these he had the invaluable assistance of his friend Mr. R. C. Trench, with whom, from this time, he became more intimately associated, since the death of Mr. Trench's eldest son, in 1840, led to his giving up

his incumbency at Curdridge in 1841, and accepting a curacy under Archdeacon Wilberforce at Alverstoke. Since those days the Government has bought land in Alverstoke, and built an exterior girdle of forts, giving the neighbourhood a still more military aspect, and somewhat injuring it as a watering-place; but during Archdeacon Wilberforce's incumbency the place was much resorted to by persons of distinction, among whom may be named the first Lord Ashburton, Mr. John Wilson Croker, and the Marchioness of Bath.

The Archdeacon was much sought after as a speaker on all sorts of public occasions. Did a regiment need new colours? He must speak on the occasion when they were presented, and obtain the old ones for his church, where those of the 44th are still suspended. Was the railway brought to Gosport? He must welcome it. Clerical meetings felt his power. A library for the clergy, in connection with Dr. Bray's associates, was established at Portsea. A Visitation sermon at Portsmouth touched the consciences of his brethren. Vestry meetings felt his advocacy of the interests of the poor, though 'The Times' newspaper misunderstood the circumstances, and in mistaken zeal launched a leading article against something he was supposed to have said. Some young candidates for Holy Orders came to reside in the parish for the sake of preparation for their work under himself and his curates.

It is almost impossible to describe the vitality and meaning which he infused into every detail, even of matters which are ordinarily regarded as mere forms of practical necessity. An examination of the entries in the baptismal and other registers during the earlier years of his work at Alverstoke will show what impressive lessons, as well as what tender sympathy, may be infused into such records. His catechizings in

church were very striking, and full of interest and instruction to the elders who were present, as well as to the catechumens. He knew how tenderly to encourage a timid answer or to recall a wandering attention, sometimes by unexpectedly addressing a child by its name, and the children whom he catechized learned to love him and his teaching.

The district visitors' meetings were no mere formal gatherings for business, but under his guidance became indirect means of uniting workers in sympathy and building them up in the faith as he counselled or explained what should be done or taught. His singular gift of spiritual tact and *savoir faire*, if such an expression be permissible, enabled him often to touch the heart or impress the imagination by the simplest movements or tones. Many felt this in the way in which he celebrated all services; and his habit, which followed him through life, of concentrating his attention at the moment on whatever person or thing was presented to him, added enormously to his power of quick apprehension and ready expression, while at the same time it equally increased his hold on those with whom he came in contact. Any one who watched him enter a room, filled with persons eager for recognition, must have been struck with the quiet concentration of manner with which he would speak for a few moments to each as if that one were the only person in the room, and then go on to another. In fact, such as Bishop Wilberforce was in later years, such was he during those earlier days at Alverstoke; only with this difference, that being settled there, with a definite charge and in close and continuous pastoral and personal contact with those around him, there could not but be more striking effects produced in individual cases than when afterwards the same capacities were spread over a wider sphere.

The narratives illustrative of this, which are furnished by those who came under his influence at Alverstoke,[2] are very numerous. One only shall be here preserved, as communicated by the present Rector, the Rev. T. Walpole. 'Well do I remember,' he says, 'the last time the Bishop held a Confirmation in Alverstoke parish church. It was on Easter-eve, 1873, two months before his sudden call. On his journey from this village, he told me the following touching story as his own thankful experience of the lasting impressions of his early counsels, when Rector here, upon one whom thirty years before he had instructed and prepared for Confirmation.'

He had received a message, he said, only a few weeks previously, late in the evening, from a sick and dying woman, living at some distance, who desired to see him. He ordered his horse, and started immediately, and when he reached the house—a humble cottage in Oxfordshire—he went up to the chamber where she lay a-dying.

She looked up at him and said, 'You know me not, but I knew you thirty years ago. When I was a girl I was visited by you at Alverstoke, and you asked me whether I would be prepared for Confirmation. I hesitated, and said no. You would not leave me, however, but sat down and spoke to me and to my young cousin, who was staying with me. We had just before engaged to go to Porchester Castle on the following Saturday for a frolic with two soldiers, with whom we were slightly acquainted; but we listened to your words, and you left us to consider whether we would be

[2] On the birth of the Prince of Wales Archdeacon Wilberforce, by way of commemorating the event, gave away, among the respectable poor of the parish, a large number, one or two hundred, of fine Witney blankets with the 'Prince's feathers' embroidered in the centre. Of these many may still be seen, preserved as heirlooms and exhibited with pride as the Bishop's gift.

candidates for the blessing and the gift which was promised to the confirmed.

'Together, as by one intent and purpose, we said to each other, "We will give up Porchester, and be candidates for confirmation." So we were taught by you and confirmed; and ever since that hour we have lived in the faith and love of Christians; now I am to die in peace.'

'She lifted up her languid body,' said the Bishop, 'to receive my benediction; and then she fell asleep in the Lord.'

His appointment to Alverstoke was almost immediately followed (January 5, 1841) by the offer of a chaplaincy to Prince Albert, of which, shortly after, he thus wrote to Mr. C. Anderson:—

Prince Albert has nominated me his chaplain. He proposed it in a most kind and pleasing letter from Anson, his secretary. He has given me, as you will see,[3] a noble compeer and 2 Heads of Houses. I suppose it will lead to no *attendance*, but in itself it is a very pleasing attention, and I like it very much.

During the early part of the year he could not be much at Alverstoke, owing to his 'residence' at Winchester Cathedral, and his diary shows him to have been chiefly occupied with reading with a view to the Bampton Lectures, which he had been appointed to deliver during 1841. Although, as already stated, no record exists of their intended subject, both Cudworth and Dr. W. H. Mill's Pantheistic Theory are

[3] The appointment was gazetted January 26; the other three chaplains being the Rev. Lord Wriothesley Russell, Canon of Windsor; the Rev. J. L. Richards, D.D., Rector of Exeter College, Oxford; and the Rev. J. Graham, D.D., Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, afterwards (1848–1865) Bishop of Chester. It may also be added that during this same month his brother Robert became Archdeacon of the East Riding of Yorkshire, vacant by the cession of Archdeacon F. Wrangham; so that with Archdeacon Manning, who had become Archdeacon of Chichester in 1840, there were now three Archdeacons in the same family.

repeatedly named as being read with this object, as also are Gieseler and Mosheim. At the same time there are frequent entries respecting 'Wilhelm Meister,' and its 'curious pictures of life and manners, and Goethe's own character displayed.'

It was while he was thus occupied, that the blow fell, which, as has been already noticed, he had in some measure anticipated, and which coloured his whole after-life to a degree which only those who knew him intimately were aware of—the death of his wife. Their fourth son, Basil Orme Wilberforce, was born on February 15; on March 7, following next after an entry in his diary 'finished Bampton Lecture No. 2,' occurs a memorandum of serious alarm respecting her; on the 8th, Dr. Locock was summoned from London, and arrived at Winchester the next evening; on the morning of the 10th she passed away.

To a man of merely ordinary affections such a blow must be at the moment crushing, and, even when afterwards recovered from, it cannot leave him altogether as he was before. Samuel Wilberforce was not a man of ordinary affections, and in his case the effect was deep and permanent. All who were in any measure admitted to his confidence know that this was so; but perhaps it has been reserved for his biographer, comparing letters written to many persons, and at long distant intervals, comparing, also, entries in his diaries stretching over almost the entire course of his subsequent career, fully to realise its abiding influence upon his character and upon his whole interior life. The deepened tone of the personal teaching in his sermons after this date has been already referred to, but this was only one of the outward indications of its inner working on his mind. There were many to whom throughout his life he appeared cheerful even to levity,

who regarded him also as keenly alive to the accidental advantages of his position, and as being ambitious of social distinction and of professional advancement. So far as outward manner and demeanour went, there may at times have been some ground for the first of the above-named opinions. Samuel Wilberforce was equally remarkable for vividness of sympathy with those around him, and for the uttermost unreserve in the expression of feelings which were quickly stirred. None so ready to enter into other people's joy, or so anxious to contribute to other people's cheerfulness. Still more emphatically true was it that he, of all men, was the readiest to enter into another's sorrow and to weep with them that weep. Both the sympathy and the elasticity of his temperament were alike far beyond the average. All this is but saying that with him the transition from one mood to another, according to that which prevailed with those around him, must often have been somewhat sudden, and that to an extent which might perplex comparative strangers, or persons of less susceptible dispositions. But as to the remainder of the judgments which have just been specified, the answer is complete. It is scarcely too much to say that all the mere personal aims of ordinary ambition were burnt up by the fiery fierceness of that one great sorrow which fell upon him at the exact moment when he was passing into a sphere where such aims would naturally have their fullest influence. That which is most noticeable is the fact that, while the blow crushed out the personal ambition, it in no way crushed the man. On the contrary, it acted as an abiding stimulus to every sense of duty, so that the increased energy and even eagerness with which he pursued each object that his multifarious duties set before him, and which many persons alleged as certain proofs of his ambition,

were in reality due to the very cause which had subdued it. No doubt there would have been but few men who would have felt the blow so keenly; fewer still on whom its lessons and its influence would have been so abiding; fewest of all, those who would have retained the energy and the elasticity after the personal motives had been destroyed. It is therefore all the more necessary, for the right understanding of his future career, and of the spirit in which he did the work to which he was called, that the reserve which would otherwise naturally be maintained as to this crisis of his life should be abandoned, and that his true nature should be shown as it really was. For this purpose it is only right, not merely to give a few extracts from his diary at the moment of his bereavement, but also to bring into juxtaposition with them a few specimens, and they are only a very few, of the way in which, year after year, the same keynote is taken up again and again, showing how the feelings and resolutions which were then elicited remained in full force throughout his life and gave the colour to his whole subsequent career. '*I fear being scourged into devotedness*' had been his expression little more than three years before.[1] It was an unconscious prophecy of what was before him. How heavy the scourge was, and how he interpreted its purpose, it must be for himself to tell.

The day of his wife's death was March 10. Never did the anniversary pass by without its being commemorated in his diary and referred to in letters to the more intimate among his friends; and his children well remember how in after years, in the midst of all the tide of business, the day was strictly kept, and how the great sorrow remained as fresh as though it had

[1] See *ante*, page 113.

only just befallen. Always, on returning to Lavington, the first thing was to visit the churchyard and to lay flowers on her grave; and after his last visit[5] thither, on May 31, 1873, so near to his own departure, he wrote to his daughter-in-law, Mrs. R. G. Wilberforce, describing the occasion as

one never to be forgotten. God's world in its beauty animate and inanimate around me; the nightingales singing His praises; and all seems to rejoice before Him. My dead seemed so near to me in my solitude: each one following another and speaking calm and hope to me, and reunion when He will.

The following are a few extracts from his diary at the time:—

March 10, 1841.—A day of unknown agony to me. Every feeling stunned. Paroxysms of convulsive anguish and no power of looking up through the darkness which had settled on my soul. . . .

March 11.—In some degree, yet but little, able to look to God, as the smiter of my soul, for healing. Oh, may HE enable me to lead a life more devoted to His glory and my Master's work. May y^e^ utter darkening of my life, which never can be dispelled, kill in me all my ambitious desires and earthly purposes, my love of money and power and place, and make me bow meekly to Christ's yoke.

Tuesday, Mch. 16.—Morn[s], a good deal alone in prayer, and then happy. Large views of life *as a time of service* seem to open. O Lord, confirm them. A good deal out with——and——. I suffer much from conversation.

Wednesday, 17.[6]—The gaslight, one only, in the damp dark morning; the Cathedral in still majesty; muffled tread, hollow voices; strange men bearing that beloved form from my door, and her mother and her husband seeing the hearse drive off with all that made life an earthly Paradise to me.

[5] The Bishop had come from London on a visit to Lord Zouch at Parham Park, and took the opportunity to ride over to Lavington.

[6] The day of the funeral, which took place at Lavington.

We followed her in the fly 5 hours after. I went round by Norwood,[7] not quite to fall in, and saw it passing below the great house. My dear Bishop arrived, and John. Bishop all affection and sympathy, strong emotions. God bless him. The funeral. I, like adamant, with the sense of being so; an awful state. . . . Many letters; one from Pusey excellent. Wrote to Pusey to thank him.

March 19, 1841, *Winchester.*—As I firmly believe that upon my use of this bitter anguish depends under God the very cast of my future life, I put down such thoughts, recollections, and resolutions as may hereafter be useful to me.

I would take a general view of the sort of lessons I am to learn from this blow, and its actual effect upon me.

1. It is a call to a different mode of life. This is my settled conviction. I have had the best of this world's blessings, the fullest enjoyment of the most faithful and strong affections. Now what [else] *can* the sudden removal of all this mean than that I am to serve Him in a different way; in a more severe, separate, self-mortifying course? I am called as Abraham was to 'come out,' to care no more for the things of this world.

This view is greatly strengthened by what I know of my temptations, w^h^ may have caused this blow—self-indulgence, covetousness, vanity.

If this be so, I should make up my mind *for my life;* yet not as *vowing* or making resolutions, which were presumptuous, but yet make up my mind not to shrink back from this burden of *desolate* service which God binds on me. This is why I should think no more of weaving other webs—a ruled case. Domestic happiness not for me, or why taken away? My call is to self-mortification. Let me review this, if I am ever in danger, and solemnly, as in God's sight, say that I can see an *intimation from Him* before I change my purpose.

This life will be exposed to a multitude of dangers; as, first, self-indulgence. I am in danger of a selfish indolence. Therefore I must strive to labour actively in my parish, to be doing kind things to all around me. *Above all,* I am called for all these reasons to a life of much prayer and communing

[7] A hamlet of Lavington.

with God. This stills, settles, strengthens the heart. Give up to God the time before given to her.

March 20, 1841.—Here is a *great* point. Bodily exercise will profit me little. I *must* live much in prayer. *Now*, I feel it to be my only resource; but I know that it will not be always so. I shall again be *busy*—employed; and then averse to the *exertion* of prayer. For this *at once* form the habit of early hours for prayer.

I shall be greatly in danger, by degrees, of ambitious desires, now that I have lost the holding back of domestic affections. *She* always checked them in me. Therefore I must pray more for a simple mind, watch the risings of ambition, seek after the gift of lowliness and love to Christ as *the* object.

Beware of lightness. Should not such a desolation give a man *gravity*, a remembered sense of things invisible?

. . . . . .

The great object I desire to gain from this affliction is a maintained communion with God. For this purpose train and practise my mind—

1. In looking earnestly and steadily to Him as having sent this affliction to be a blessing to me, as loving me, as training me, as being my Father.

2. Cultivate a sense of life being altered; that it *is* altered; that it is not merely that my *feelings* are now crushed, but that *life* IS *changed*, that God has broken its dream; that I am called to take the cup of my Master's sorrow and drink it. This I must do *mainly* by gaining from God's gift a *love of Him*. Means to which are—

(*a*) Increased Meditation.—Take a more thoughtful view of life.

(*b*) Increased Devotions.—Opportunity; more time; more call to open my heart to God. Then watch against that weakness of my heart which would lean on the smaller remaining props, the sympathies of my friends, relations, &c., instead of leaning on God. Great danger of this—of throwing out *pro*-legs.

(*c*) Separation from Earthly Things.—Many opportunities for renouncing the pleasures of life in all ways. Re-

member Fasting, &c.,—yet only as a means, useful only because I am so weak. Then, again, as to earthly plans, rising in the world, &c. What watchfulness do I need here. Here an opportunity of rising higher—a temptation to falling lower.

I fear falling from these present views and living a mere worldly life. The guard must be *perpetual.* Natural feelings will alter even in my broken heart. I must, therefore, win *now* from God a sober, settled, sense of life's emptiness, of His love to me in Christ, of the blessedness of truly living to and with Him. This my great want.

I must specially guard against self-contemplation and vanity. I am conscious of danger here, even in my very sorrow. God help me. Oh, if all this should pass away and leave me no nearer to God, *i.e. more* worldly!

Years after, in 1846, at Cuddesdon, when Bishop of Oxford, on the anniversary, November 30, of his consecration, he writes:—

I have taken some time for prayer and meditation to-day, looking through my former life, reading my former entries. How wonderfully fresh it all is still. How perpetually is SHE before me! In business, in society, when I seem full of other things, how there is a constant under-*base* ringing secretly in my ears. Yet, how little have I learned of all this sorrow should have taught me.

I have been looking back on the past year.[8] I want, 1. More secret prayer. 2. More dwelling on Scripture. 3. More command of my tongue. 4. More love to God and souls.

I put these down here, that if God spares me to another year, I may specially and closely question myself as to them. If I am to *be* a blessing, I must be more devout, more of a saint than others, and this will give me all I want, boldness, deadness to self. My heart is very, very heavy.

[8] The first of his Episcopate.

Again, three years later, on the same anniversary:—

Lavington, Nov. 30, 1849.—I have come down here for a day of quiet and prayer, on this momentous anniversary. I was early up, and in prayer until 8. Then to Holy Communion at church; after, stayed there and went through, I hope with all my heart, the Consecration Service. How little way have I made. Then visited *her* grave. Then came in and read over some past entries, and now I desire to review, as in God's sight, my life. . . . .

I have been trying to review my 'Episcopate.' The master-fault, not doing all enough *to please God.* All lesser spring out of that, run into it. My own pleasure, good reputation, friends, favour, occupation, inclination to be employed usefully, how these mix in! Resolve—

1. To examine myself more on this—to strive more against it—by setting myself often of fixed purpose to do for God with an eye to Christ; by still more earnest prayer for this great gift of losing sight of myself. I have prayed *daily* for this of late; by seeking to grow in love to Christ, then all easy. Then—

2. Not enough keeping the resolution and promise of exercising myself in Scripture. *Mem.* not to lose the highest parts of my office as spiritual pastor in the lower or table-serving parts. I feel *this* danger.

3. *Ambition.*—How deadly in the Church of Christ. *Vanity.*—How weakening and contemptible. *Love of ease and money.* How growing, and strangling to the Divine life.

4. Turns of this year: (*a*) Domestic matters. . . . . (*b*) Dangerous sickness, and near view of death. (*c*) Evident withdrawal of Royal favour; G. E. A.'s[9] death bearing on this. Oh, help me to be single-eyed! *Make* me single-eyed to THY glory. Deliver me from vanity, from self-trust, from ambition, self-seeking, especially in mine office; suggest to me how to be useful; guide me in doubtful things; give me tenderness and firmness, boldness and humility, activity and thoughtfulness, love and zeal. Keep me from even *seeming*

[9] Referring to the death of Mr. Anson, private secretary to Prince Albert; with whom Bishop Wilberforce was on terms of especial confidence.

double. Make my righteousness of purpose plain. Teach me to submit when (as in 1847) I am falsely charged with want of simplicity.[1] Help me to be mighty in intercession. Work a work, if it please Thee, by me amongst my clergy, and laity, and parishes. Help me to lead, and them to follow, in self-denial, humility, simplicity. May the Cross be stamped on me, on my life, my thoughts, my words. Keep me from censorious thoughts, unkind words, judgments of others, negligence in relations, colouring, unfairness. . . . .

5. Resolutions. To aim more at the *interiora* of my office, in my engagements, in conversation with my clergy: more study of God's Word, more prayer. A special 12 (noon) prayer. When able, try to get to some system of intercourse with the more religious clergy as in retreat (Lord, lead me to this). To begin work with a more special dedication to God. Aim at more self-denial and mortification, less softness. Aim at increased knowledge of Ordination candidates, more pains beforehand to find them out. Danger of sinking into official routine. Cultivate more and more a living interest in the work of every earnest-minded clergyman, whether of *these* or *those* opinions. The great danger of the Church of England SECULARITY. I set to strive against this;

(*a.*) In myself, in my own soul:—Here the dangers and remedies comparatively simple:—love to Christ, doing all to Him, watchfulness against worldly estimate. Yet difficulties as to how far I should, as now, mix freely in society. If I abstain, it must be *altogether*. Exclusiveness is the evil. Is not my call to go *everywhere*, where not sinful, and *witness?* Some have John the Baptist's call. Have I not the other? to have sackcloth *inwardly*.

(*b.*) In my household and family. Here many more difficulties. I might easily shock by non-compliance as to things in themselves indifferent. The *first* (*a*) the real remedy: have less personal share in such things: great vigilance here. Often self-denial and prayer.

(*c.*) In trying by degrees to raise my clergy, by (1) example; (2) intercourse; (3) if God should ever give me

[1] Referring to his conduct in reference to the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the Bishopric of Hereford.

the means, *a Diocesan College, invaluable here* (I visitor). Secularity, for many reasons, the weakness of our Church. . . .

The following lines, too tender and too perfect to admit of one word of comment, bearing date, as will be observed, 'Lavington, February 10, 1849,' nearly eight years after his loss, were found among his papers after his death :—

A VISION.

Lavington, Feb. 10, 1849.

I sat within my glad home, and round about me played
Four children in their merriment, and happy noises made;
Beside me sate their mother in her loveliness and light,
I ne'er saw any like her, save in some vision bright.

It was in life's young morning that our hearts together grew,
Beneath its sparkling sunlight, and in its steeping dew;
And the sorrows and the joys of a twelve years' changeful life
Had drawn more closely to me my own, my blessed wife.

Then at our door One knocked and we rose to let Him in,
For the night was wild and stormy, and to turn Him thence were sin:
With a 'Peace be to this household' His shelterers He blest,
And sat Him down amongst us like some expected guest.

The children's noise was hushed, the mother softly spoke,
And my inmost spirit thrilled with the thoughts which in me woke;
For it seemed like other days within my memory stored,
Like Mamre's tented plain or Emmaus' evening board.

His form was veiléd from us, His mantle was not raised,
But we felt that eyes of tenderness and love upon us gazed:
His lips we saw not moving, but a deep and inward tone
Spake like Thunder's distant voices unto each of us alone :—

'Full often ye have called Me and bid Me to your home,
And I have listened to your words and at your prayer am come,
And now My voice is strange to you and "wherefore art Thou here?"
Your throbbing hearts are asking, with struggling Hope and Fear.

'It was My Love which shielded your helpless infant days,
It was My Care which guided you through all life's dangerous ways.
I joined your hearts together, I blessed your marriage vow,
Then trust and be not fearful though My ways seem bitter now.'

We spake no word of answer, nor said He any more,
But as one about to leave us He passéd to the door,
Then ere He crossed the threshold He beckoned with His hand
That she, who sat beside me, should come at His command.

Then rose that wife and mother and went into the night,
She followed at His bidding and was hidden from our sight:
And though my heart was breaking I strove my will to bow,
For I saw His hands were piercéd, and thorns had torn His brow.

Years after it was still the same. In 1853 the entry in the diary runs thus:—

March 10.—Woke early, with all the events of this day 12 years as fresh as yesterday before me. My vain hope that she slept. The heavier and more laboured sleep. The dews of death!

In 1855 the record of an unusually busy day of Confirmations ends with:—

Full all day of thoughts of 1841. Oh, that I had profited more by that life-sorrow!

In 1861 the entry is:—

March 10, *Sunday.*—Up early, and celebrated at Mixbury. Reviewed the way God has led me—how mercifully. My sweet one at rest. My own keeping through all these years. Oh, if my sins had not forced the enduring chastisement of this day, my life had been too bright for earth.

And in 1864, after mentioning the day's occupations, a similar conclusion recurs. The complete entry is as follows:—

March 10.—Ecclesiastical Commission. The Royal baptism. A good deal of talk as to Suffragan Bishops, &c., with Gladstone, Lord Russell, G. Grey, and Chancellor. Down to Glympton. *All my thoughts all day in the Close House at Winchester:*—1841 *seemed yesterday.*

So again, when, early in 1865, his diary records the family gathering at Cuddesdon, he wrote:—

Jan. 9.—At ¼ to 6 dearest Ella[2] came, and well. *All* save Herbert[3] and my sainted wife *together*. Oh, how I *long* for her at such times, and call on her as I lie awake at night to show herself to me, if she may, but once to gladden these weary eyes.

And once more when, during the same year, his health was proposed at a large gathering of clergy, by his old friend, Sir George Prevost, the entry is—

July 26.—Luncheon in tent. Dear Prevost gave my health and alluded to our long friendship. I tried to reply, but the past was too strong for me. I thought of *Her*, &c., and I saw I should burst into tears, and so gave up and sat down.

A few specimens of his letters are here added :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Mr. C. Anderson.

The Close, March 13, 1841.

My dearest Charles,—Your letter just received has filled my heart and my eyes very full. God bless you for your sympathy. The blow is greater than even you conceive. But even now I feel that it is far less than I have required. May God only give me grace to profit by it. It has, after all, come upon me like a thunder-clap. I had, indeed, never reckoned upon it. Dark shadows truly had been, often of late, cast over me, and they chilled my soul; but they passed; and in them somehow I always thought that I was alarmed lest my heart should cling too fondly to her, but that after all she would be spared. . . . .

Oh! my dearest Charles, how much less have I valued such a loan than I should have done. And yet God knows I loved her tenderly. But then I had loved her from my boyhood. I had thought of her, I am certain, *daily*, at school and at college; and now for 13 years almost of married life—well! I do not repine; I believe not at all. But I long to learn my lesson; and I know, calmly and settledly, that a sunless life, as far as earth goes, is before me, and I do not

[2] His daughter, Mrs. Pye. [3] His eldest son, then at sea.

wish it otherwise. I wish to do my work meekly and cheerfully till I also am called. Many thanks for your offer of coming; but you must not think of it; the distance forbids. On Wednesday morning we propose going to Lavington and laying her the same afternoon in that peaceful churchyard. My heart is very, very full. God bless you. Write again to me. I am ever your own friend,

S. WILBERFORCE.

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to the Rev. R. C. Trench.

The Close, March 15, 1841.

My dear Friend,—Most sincerely do I thank you for your note, which reached me to-day. It has, I trust, helped me all through this day to pitch my heart to the note of Christian comfort. Indeed, I have been greatly supported. Yet the shoots of agony are and must be fearful. I am never quite easy but when I am in prayer.

Yes, dearest friend, I do strive (and in some little measure, I hope, succeed) to reach out into the real things which we see not, but which are close to us. I do rest on the thought of her peace—on the life of the world to come.

But I fear my heart sinking as the excitement and the stunning of these days pass off, and the heavy daily burden clings to me. Yet HE will still be with me, and I shall yet praise Him. Oh! if I can serve Him better for this sore anguish, what cause shall I have to rejoice in it!

We are going to Lavington to the funeral on Wednesday. If I was *quite* sure that my brother Robert would not be here, I would ask whether you would like a place with us in our carriage, or whether it would be too much for you. But he may come and fill it. At all events you will remember us at 4 on Wednesday afternoon. I wish to have the baptism of our little one on Friday at 4. Can you come then? I will put it off if you cannot, but would rather not do so.

Once more, may God bless you for your true Christian sympathy. I look on your coming to Alverstoke as a most signal mercy to me. But I am very much racked at night. Ever, dearest friend, believe me to be your most aff.

S. WILBERFORCE.

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to the Rev. Sir G. Prevost.

The Close, March 17, 1841.

My dear Prevost,—Your affectionate letter filled my heart with many remembrances of old times, and my eyes with many tears. Yes; you are associated with many an early and long-cherished hope which it pleased God very far more than to fulfil through almost 13 years of married life of most unusual blessedness, and which HE has now been pleased suddenly to close in darkness at noonday. It must be that my soul is torn with anguish; but I am deeply thankful for a certain measure of *stillness* under the stroke. I dare not and I do not wish to look forward, either for myself or my 5 poor children; but I earnestly desire to follow the unambiguous warning of such a stroke. Pray for me that I may.

I heartily thank you for your affection in being willing to bear the trouble of a journey to me. I shall at some future time *greatly* like to see you; but I believe that at present my best course is to keep myself as *quiet* as possible—'he sitteth alone and keepeth silence'—so that just for the present I could hardly bear the excitement of seeing you. Yet I *do* yearn after you, dearest Prevost; and many a remembrance of Belmont and of Oxford and of Marden Park chokes my heart as I write. May God bless you, as He has blessed you in your family.

I have just to-day returned from visiting Lavington with her beloved remains; in that peaceful churchyard by her father and her brothers and her sister (only two of whom are now left) and her infant daughter (born 6 years ago), we have laid down her earthly tabernacle, in the blessed assurance of the resurrection to eternal life and the life of the world to come. There may God re-unite us; and 'the time is short.' Will you write to me again, and believe me your old and heartily attached friend,

S. WILBERFORCE.

A year afterwards, when his chaplaincy to Prince Albert had led to repeated attendance at Court, and there was everything to divert his mind from his loss, he thus wrote to his own and his late wife's most inti-

mate friend, Miss Louisa Noel, who by this time was a confirmed invalid :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Alverstoke, March 8, 1842.

My dearest Sister,—You will not expect me to say one word of what overfills both our souls. This week too will pass. Oh that its fires may purge my heart of abundant dross, and may a God of all Grace be with you also. *I* have work which must be done every day ; but you have all the day empty for those storms which bow me to the ground whenever they have room to arise. But *even you* cannot conceive for an instant the immeasurable extent of my loss. It is even now almost madness to me when the full sense of it suddenly meets me in that weight of weary desolation which falls down upon me. The enclosed letters will tell you what I have been doing. Two visits to Brighton—increased interest in many ways, new views of the *dramatis personæ* coming out, increased kindness of treatment. Ordered to publish my 4 Sermons. I returned with them to Portsmouth, brought Herbert and Ella to them by the Queen's desire, who talked with them, shook hands, &c. . . . I must end, but am always, my dearest sister, and most of all in the shadows of this valley, your own brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

And, thirty years afterwards, on April 23, 1871, writing to his daughter-in law, Mrs. R. G. Wilberforce, in reference to the death of his son Ernest Wilberforce's wife, he says :—

I can feel for him. Tuesday is HER birthday, and used to be, in my happy life, the feast-day of the year. Now it comes and goes in sadness and gloom.

Before closing the present page in his life, it should be added that ere the month ended yet one more sorrow fell upon him. On March 31 died the aged grandmother of his deceased wife, of whom mention

has been made in one at least of his letters previously quoted. The thread of life, frail as it necessarily was at her great age, was too feeble to withstand the shock of her granddaughter's death. The circumstance is referred to in the following letter :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Putney Heath, April 2, 1841.

My own dearest Sister,—You may not perhaps have yet heard that the blow which has fallen so heavily upon us has brought after it the death of my beloved Emily's aged grandmother, who breathed her last here at 2 o'clock on Wednesday morning, three weeks after my bitter stroke. She never rallied from it; but sat silently mourning, overheard often by those nearest to her to whisper to herself. 'And is she too taken!'

I came up here yesterday with Mrs. John Sargent,[4] on the account reaching us, to see once more her remains. It was altogether strange, standing by her silent bed: the contrast and the agreement of feelings with those of 3 weeks ago :—the good old age, the expected gathering, the superfluous lingering on the scene and awaiting the summons,—with the sudden rending of life's silver cord in its utmost beauty and strength, with the breaking of hearts and crushing of fondest affections ; and the common rest and the desired haven, and another welcome in the happy world. Oh, beloved sister! how does one's soul long to be 'at rest,' to be with those who 'sleep in Jesus,' to be 'with the Lord.' Though, even as the pen writes it, we feel to know no more what it means than a man born blind can know the glow of sunshine. I have heard with deep pain that you too are quite unwell. . . . We return to-night to Winchester, and on Tuesday next shall be again gathered at Lavington. Oh! how in that churchyard do I enter into 'The HARVEST is the end of the world.' May God bless you, my dearest sister. I am ever your most truly own brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

[4] From this time Mrs. J. Sargent, his wife's mother, resided with the Bishop to the end of her life.

Thus far, then, the year 1841 has been shown to have been a crisis and a turning-point in Samuel Wilberforce's inner life: it was also a period of more than common movement, alike in the political and the ecclesiastical world. It was in January 1841, that the famous Tract 90 made its appearance. It was on March 8, 1841, that the protest against it of the 'Four Tutors'[5] was published. This again was followed, on the 15th, by the hurried[6] resolution of the Heads of Houses affirming that such modes of interpretation as it suggested, 'evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of the errors which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object and are inconsistent with the due observance of' the statutes regarding subscription to those Articles. Party spirit ran very high between the adherents to and the opponents of the views of the Tract writers; and when, later on in the year, Mr. J. Keble's resignation of the Professorship of Poetry led to a contest for the vacant chair, it became the occasion of a trial of strength between the rival schools of opinion. The candidates were Mr. (afterwards Archdeacon) Garbett and Mr. Isaac Williams, himself a contributor to the Tracts, and, in particular, the writer of the Tracts Nos. 80 and 87, on 'Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge,' which had been the object of much hostile criticism.

[5] These were, T. T. Churton, M.A., Brasenose; H. B. Wilson, B.D., St. John's; J. Griffiths, M.A., Wadham; A. C. Tait, M.A., Balliol.

[6] 'Hurried'—for it should in justice be remembered that it was only on March 10 that the Tract with the Four Tutors' protest was laid before the Board of Heads, and that the Committee of Heads for the examination of the Tract was named only on Friday the 12th. On Sunday the 14th Mr. Newman and others wrote to the Vice-Chancellor requesting that the resolution of the Board might be delayed until a letter in explanation, then in the press, could be published. The 'Letter to Dr. Jelf' was actually published on Tuesday the 16th, but the Board's condemnation was made known on Monday, and so anticipated Mr. Newman's explanation by *one day*.

An actual contest was avoided by the withdrawal of Mr. Williams.[7] It was also the year of the foundation of the Jerusalem Bishopric, from which so little has resulted, and of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund, which has done so much towards planting the Church of England in every quarter of the globe.

As regards political affairs, it was the year when the Conservative reaction, which had been so carefully fostered by Sir Robert Peel, bore fruit in the overthrow of Lord Melbourne's Ministry, which had lasted since 1835; while, on the other hand, the Anti-Corn Law League, destined ere long to break up, for a time, the Conservative party, was now rapidly becoming a power in the country. Each and all of these have to be mentioned here, inasmuch as no man of Samuel Wilberforce's temperament could avoid taking a side upon public questions such as these, and his correspondence will show that his feelings and his opinions were keen and decisive.

Towards the Oxford movement he still maintained the cautious moderation to which more than once his letters have already borne witness, and it is particularly noticeable that in the contest for the Poetry Professorship he took the side of Mr. Garbett, even though the utmost pressure was brought to bear upon him in favour of Mr. Williams. As regards the Jerusalem Bishopric, which met with scant favour at the hands of High Churchmen generally, it was the same. He was for the time largely under the influence of Chevalier Bunsen, and will be seen to have entertained great hopes from the *rapprochement* between the King of Prussia and the English Church, of which

[7] The committees of the respective candidates agreed to abide by the result of a comparison of the numbers of promises of support which they had received, when it was found that there were, for Mr. Garbett, 921; for Mr. Isaac Williams, 623.

the scheme for the Jerusalem Bishopric[8] was regarded as the symbol.

It is noticeable that Archdeacon Wilberforce was one of a deputation from the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews which waited upon the King of Prussia on the occasion of his visit to London, with reference to the Jerusalem Bishopric, and presented an address in which the following paragraph occurs:—'It is our especial duty and delight to hail in your Majesty a distinguished and chosen friend of the great cause in which we have been so long and so anxiously engaged. It has pleased the Almighty to turn your Majesty's heart to thoughts of protection and peace towards His ancient people, to raise you up, like Cyrus, for the accomplishment of prophecy, and to set the example among the kings of the earth of that sublime and Christian spirit which rejoices to use all that God has given of wealth and station and power for the defence and consolation of the oppressed and destitute.'

Sir R. H. Inglis and Sir W. Farquhar were also members of this deputation; and Dr. Hook published a pamphlet entitled 'Reasons for Contributing towards the Support of an English Bishop at Jerusalem.'

As to politics it is no wonder that Archdeacon Wilberforce was vehemently Conservative, and that strong expressions escaped him on the subject of the Anti-Corn Law agitation. The persistent attacks on the Church Establishment which, though with gradually waning force, had marked the period succeeding the Reform Bill, had contributed much to bring about the Conservative reaction, and had naturally thrown the clergy more and more earnestly into the Conservative

[8] By the Act of Parliament on the subject it was settled that the Bishop should be nominated alternately by the Crowns of England and Prussia, the Archbishop of Canterbury having a veto on the nominations of the latter.

cause. The Anti-Corn Law League was entirely a Liberal movement, its strength was in the large towns, and the circumstance, that it was supported with great eagerness by the Dissenting ministers as a body, was not calculated to recommend it to the clergy at large.

As to other events of secondary importance, but which find more or less reference in the letters of the period, it should be added that it was on September 2 of this year that the parish church of Leeds was consecrated,[9] and on October 17 that Bishop Selwyn was consecrated as the first Bishop of New Zealand. The mention of Dr. Hook may not unfairly introduce a paragraph from a letter to Mr. C. Anderson, in which Samuel Wilberforce's thorough antipathy to whatever savoured of party spirit is most strongly illustrated. Through life Samuel Wilberforce and Walter Farquhar Hook were fast friends; but when, in April 1841, the Vicar of Leeds, exasperated by some manifestations of factious opposition, published a letter to the Bishop of Ripon, in which he urged that the time was come for High Churchmen to act together *as a party*, Archdeacon Wilberforce could write as follows to his friend who approved it:—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Mr. C. Anderson.

Alverstoke, May 6, 1841.

My dearest Anderson,— . . . I quite understand all the feelings you express about Dr. Hook's letter, and see how you have come to feel as you do. Yet I cannot quite assent to what you say, and I think you do not mean it any more

[9] The consecration of the new parish church of Leeds was a striking event. The venerable Archbishop of York was the chief officiant; the Bishop of Ripon, Bishop Doane, of New Jersey, who preached the sermon—having come from his North American diocese for this purpose—and Dr. Lowe, the Bishop of Ross and of Argyll, were also present; together with no fewer than three hundred clergy. The church, as is well known, is one of the largest in England, accommodating 2,450 worshippers.

than I should. Hook's letter pained me deeply. It is the very opposite of his own 'Call to Union,' and it seems to me really quite dreadful that he should avow that he thinks it a *duty* to split into a party. For this is really the force of his words. Whereas it is our very blessedness in the Church to know no other party or leader, but to be content in her to take the good of all, and be followers of none beside. Have you seen—if not, do order—'A Letter' to me just published by Maurice, of Guy's Hospital, on this subject? It is a shilling thing, and well worth reading.

What a rascally piece of conduct is this Corn Law and Sugar business of the Ministers! Will Lord —— leave them, or give up all for them? They who follow expediency do commonly lose all, first or last. And how despicable is their truckling to Dissenters. . . .

And again, September 9, 1841, he wrote:—

Your account of the consecration of Leeds parish church is most exciting, and I should have liked greatly to see it. The *visible* has been far too much given up by us, as if the Church was not in her very constitution essentially visible, and must be so if we are to see her ruling over the hearts of the remarkable compound called *man*.

What a sight was the Anti-Corn Law Conference. I want Maitland to write a brief history of it as a tract. Such a thing done in his sly, caustic, knowing way, would, I am certain, do an immense deal of good. It was a startling and indicative contrast that the Dissenting teachers were prating bad politics and bad economics about the cheapening of corn and all provisions to themselves at Manchester, while the clergy of the Church Catholic were *praying* for fine weather in which the fruits of the earth might be gathered in.

The reference in the foregoing paragraph is to a very remarkable series of Conferences on the Corn Laws held at Manchester and lasting four entire days, from August 10 to 13. At this meeting no fewer than 632 Dissenting ministers were present, while two clergy only of the Church of England and two of the Scottish

Church attended it. The Wesleyans held aloof, the Committee of the Wesleyan Conference having prohibited the attendance of their ministers. These Conferences were followed by the announcement of Anti-Corn Law Lectures in Dissenting chapels in many parts of the country.

On August 20 of this year he preached the Latin sermon [1] at St. Paul's Cathedral before the Convocation of Canterbury, whose meetings then of course were only formal, but not without thoughts and anticipations of that revival to which he was himself hereafter so largely to contribute; as is shown by his reference to it in a letter to his brother Robert:—

Archdn. S. Wilberforce to Archdn. R. I. Wilberforce.

Athenæum, Aug. 21, 1841.

My dearest Robert,—My sermon has gone off very well. People seemed pleased. The Archbishop, Bp. of London, &c., very complimentary. All is stirring here. There is a great talk of amend[g] the Archbishop's address by putting in a general request for a *soon* Convocation—not that *this* may now sit for despatch of business, which is thought, by most, premature.

Inter alios, Archdn. Thorp, Hodson, Proctor, Woodgate, Cornish (from Cornwall), Round, &c., attended, and I have seen them.

I have seen a good deal of Bunsen. What a noble fellow he is. He is now it seems bringing to completion a truly noble plan by w[h], I trust, on a back current, Episcopacy will flow into Prussia.[2] It is at present an entire secret, but he has

[1] *Concio ad Clerum Provinciæ Cantuarensis in Ædc Paulinâ habita* XX[o] *die Aug.* MDCCCXLI. The sermon involved a general survey of the state of the Church, and of the office of the Church as the watchman appointed to warn the nation regarding moral and social dangers; the text being Ezekiel xxxiii. 7: 'Thou, O Son of man, I have set thee a *watchman*,' &c.

[2] Somewhat similar hopes, doomed unhappily to like disappointment, had been aroused during the latter part of the reign of Queen Anne, when proposals were made by the King of Prussia for an ecclesiastical union between Prussia and

made me privy to his councils. His admiration of his king is quite delightful.

On Sunday, September 26, Archdeacon Wilberforce was called upon for the first time to preach at the Chapel Royal, Windsor, in his capacity of Chaplain to Prince Albert, and he thus wrote to his friend, Louisa Noel :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Windsor Castle, Sept. 26, 1841.

My dearest Sister,—Before I go to bed I must, as you desire, write a single line to you. All has gone on most smoothly and pleasantly here. I felt no nervousness about the service, because there I was on high ground: but about the first dinner, &c. I did. However, things fell rapidly into their proper places; and after dinner, when the Queen came to speak to me, she spoke so pleasantly and kindly that I was quite composed by it.

It was quite a small party at dinner, only 18 in number; and in the evening we sat round a small rosewood table (the Queen, the Prince, Lord Portman, myself; Miss Lister, maid-of-honour; Mr. Stopford, Canon of Windsor, in residence; Baron Stockmar, Baroness Lehzen; Lord Sydney, in waiting; Mrs. Stopford, Lady Portman, in waiting), and were quite quiet.

In the afternoon I had quite a long talk, *tête-à-tête*, in his library with the Prince about the Church, &c. &c., and very pleasing he was. This evening, after dinner, the Queen came and spoke to me most kindly about my sermon, &c. &c., and is going to send me in one of her carriages to the railroad to-morrow. In short, nothing can have been more kind than my treatment throughout. My only mistake was not asking for the Princess Royal, whom I should much like to have seen.

England. These proposals were made through Dr. Jablonski, whose long residence in England had fully informed him as to the English Church, its doctrine, its discipline, and its formularies. The reception of the Episcopal succession from the Anglican bishops was insisted on as the indispensable condition on the Anglican side, and it is noticeable that no objection seems to have been made, and that Dr. Jablonski was in favour of it. Though the proposal was coldly received by Archbishop Tenison, it was warmly supported by the Archbishop of York (Sharp), and apparently might have been carried out, but that political events intervened which caused it to drop out of consideration.

I preached on the Widow of Nain—a sermon I hoped likely to be useful.

You know, dearest sister, better than any one the thought which has been all day in my mind, of not being able to tell anything, and so there being no use observing or liking anything. But oh! *she* is better off, better by far. And no doubt it is safer for me to be steeled by such fires against many dangerous influences. But I must go bed, having to be off at 5 to-morrow to reach the Visitation at Portsmouth. Ever, dearest sister, believe me to be your own brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

In a letter of the same date to his brother Robert he adds that 'the Queen came and talked with him after dinner about his father and *his* visit, and his mention of her in his Journals when she was two years old,' and that in the above-mentioned conversation with the Prince 'he (the Prince) showed himself very right-principled, regretting the Liberal tendencies of things undisguisedly.'

The next letter shows how much Chevalier Bunsen and the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme were at this time occupying his thoughts:—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Nocl.

Alverstoke, Oct. 20, 1841.

My dearest Sister,—I will answer your letter straightway; how can I do less when you have written to me *yourself?* I hope you have not suffered from the exertion; if it makes Augusta Terrace less like Siberia, how great a thing is it.

1. About Bunsen, I entirely agree with you, and have written to Blackwell very explicitly. I have of late got *very* intimate with Bunsen; when I was last in London I saw him almost every day; we dined together at the Athenæum. I went home with him and spent hours. Once I went with him to Lambeth. He showed me numbers of the King's private letters, and detailed to me his conversations. The King's intention is most pure. He quite wishes to gain over his

people to true Episcopacy; he longs to give up the keys of the Church, but says, 'No, thank you,' to the Lutherans, who wish to take them from him, 'because,' he says, 'God gave them me no doubt to keep till I could give them up to His Bishops, and then I will.' The King seems to me to have acted in the best way. He is a noble creature. You know that his Queen was a Romanist; when she came to Prussia the old King was very anxious she should turn Protestant: after some time she was convinced that the Roman errors were wrong. The Crown Prince, as he then was, seemed to discourage her talking on the subject; so she told the old King that she wished to be received into communion with the Reformed Church. He was overjoyed, and, knowing his son's earnest religion, sent for him and told him as the greatest of all delights. He said, 'My dear' (I forget her name), 'I fear you may have been led to this by love to me, and, thinking it would please me, rather than by a deep conviction of your own heart; but remember I loved you when you were a Roman Catholic.' She avowed her *conviction.* He said, 'Well, at all events, I wish you to wait *one year.* Review and re-consider the subject. And then if you are of the same mind you can conform.' At the year's end she was; and then he gave loose to his joy, and she saw with how intense a delight he welcomed a real convert into the Reformed Church.

If the time would serve I could tell you most interesting traits as to this Jewish Bishopric and his right-minded simplicity of purpose; but they must be kept till we meet. . . . I cannot write more to-night than to say that I am in most constant affection ever your own brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

P.S.—I have not answered about 'Orders.' It is a disputed point. *I* have no doubt that St. Ambrose was consecrated without previous ordination. He speaks of himself as not having hurried in one day through Deacon's and Priest's Orders, and it seems clear that he was very speedily from a layman a Bishop, the only explanation being, that he passed straight to it. But the King of Prussia's hope is by degrees to get over this very difficulty by getting his *future*

Bishops ordained in Palestine, in order to co-operate with us. Of course, a stubborn old full-grown Lutheran would kick, and talk just as ——'s friend did.

A little later on occurs the following entry in his diary, marking, *inter alia*, his increasing favour at Court :—

Friday, Nov. 12, 1841.—Off to breakfast with Bunsen, and then Palace. Prince *would* see me :—shewed me the young Duke of Cornwall asleep in bassinet. Duchess of Kent 'wished to be introduced.' I called at the Prince's desire. She very gracious, but speaks English poorly. 'The Prince thinks very much of you.' 'Where do you live?' 'Oh, it is a pity that it is so far from us,' &c. &c. Then luncheon at Athenæum. Saw James Stephen : long talk about Jesuits (he preparing an article, I suppose), then of his assurance that Sir R. Peel would *quam citissimè* call me *episcopari*, &c.

Meanwhile the excitement regarding the Tractarians was still increasing ; and in the autumn the Bishop of Winchester charged against the movement, or, as Samuel Wilberforce wrote (October 14) to his brother Robert,—

against the *dangers* he foresees in the Oxford views, rather than against the men. After Keble's unfortunate letter to Coleridge, I do not see how he could do less than state his views. Keble's letter was a direct *appeal*.

Not that he altogether concurred in his diocesan's mode of dealing with the subject, for in his diary he wrote :—

Friday, Nov. 5.—To Farnham. Bishop most kind ; but, *eheu!* too little *Church* in his conscientious opposition to Tract errors. Tendency of this must be, to form all into 2 sects : one 'Anti-Church,' the other, 'Tract,' instead of Church-anti-Tract versus Newman. Spoke to him on this, but could not persuade him. John warm too, and afraid about R. The heavy news of poor Sibthorp's [3] fall.

[3] Mr. Sibthorp, incumbent of St. James', Ryde, joined the Church of Rome in 1841. After returning for a time to the Church of England, he again, in 1864, became a Roman Catholic. He died in April 1879.

Respecting Mr. Sibthorp's secession, which made a great sensation at the time, he wrote to Mr. Charles Anderson on November 30—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Mr. C. Anderson.

Poor Sibthorp! His head was, as you know, never a sound one. He had got entangled in a correspondence with a priest, a clever fellow, at Cowes, on some scheme of uniting Rome and England. He had exposed himself to temptation by long-formed habits of *grievous* self-will in religious matters, breaking out in his Low-Church excesses of old, and in mummeries of late, which, he knew, grieved all his brethren. Then he held the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, that uniting is to be gained by the members of the Church Catholic through union with one visible centre. Then he craved after *gifts*, and thought Rome, as of old he thought Methodism, had them; and in this frame of mind he went to Oscott with Newman, to discuss a scheme for the union of the Roman and Anglican Churches. He had no intention whatever then of joining Rome, but he was betrayed and fell; and a *grievous* fall it is. Ryde is given up again, I fear, to party spirit in its worst shapes.

I have been in London once or twice lately, from Southwark. The Prince a little *moistened* me, by taking me to see the young Duke of Cornwall, and a very fine boy he is. I had a most interesting 3 days at Eton, at Selwyn's farewell sermon. I preached once, and he once. He is just setting out, and my friend Whitehead with him, as chaplain. Sydney Smith says it will make quite a revolution in the dinners of New Zealand: *tête d'Evêque* will be the most *recherché* dish, and your man will add, 'And there is *cold clergyman* on the side-table.'

And the same subjects were referred to in a letter of about the same date to his brother Robert:—

I had a most deeply interesting visit to Windsor. Selwyn is a noble fellow, the very picture of manly simplicity. Coleridge and Patteson (judges), W. E. Gladstone, James Hope, Baddeley, E. Coleridge, &c. &c., were there, and a most *spirituel* gathering it was.

As I got home, the painful news of poor Sibthorp's fall reached me. It seems to have been hasty, and, in all its circumstances, strange. He left his chapel unserved; for the fact of his having turned Papist had to be told to the assembling congregation by some boys who were standing round the closed doors. The consternation is complete. I am thinking of a 'Letter' to him, to try and take off the moral unsettling, of lay minds especially, which this must cause; to show that it is *not* the true result of Church principles; but whether I shall do it or not, I am not sure. . . .

With regard to the contest for the Poetry Professorship at Oxford, there was much to have led him to support, or at least not to oppose, Mr. Isaac Williams. There was first his brother Robert's influence, and next the earnest persuasions of his most intimate friend, Sir G. Prevost. But not only did he promise his vote to Mr. Garbett, but when Mr. Gladstone, in the interests of peace, desired to bring about the retirement of both the candidates, and sought the Archdeacon's support to the proposal, he declined even this; first, on the ground that it might seem to give some amount of apparent triumph to the supporters of Mr. Williams, and next, on the ground of his Bishop's strong objection to the step. The moment was a critical one, and Archdeacon Wilberforce's conduct was so decisive that it is necessary to give it a prominence which would otherwise seem superfluous. The following are the letters which passed on the subject; and the somewhat disjointed style of the first seems to attest the strong emotion under which it was written :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Rev. Sir G. Prevost.

Alverstcke Rectory, Nov. 26, 1841.

Dearest Prevost,—I do not think I ever saw your handwriting with sorrow before; I knew at once the purpose of your letter. Yet, you love me and honesty of desire well

enough, not to be weaned from me. My bare and desolate heart feels strangely to crave after old affections, and I know not how I could bear to think you were alienated from me.

I *had* hoped to vote *for* Isaac Williams; and felt sure that I need under no circumstances vote against him; for no mere interest of poetry, even if a fitter man appeared, could compel me to vote against old friendship. But Pusey's unhappy letter about it has quite altered the circumstances of the case. He has made it a distinct question of peculiar tenets, and thus falls in remarkably with the last 'British Critic.' I cannot hide from myself that now it *must* be, whatever one means, simply expressing publicly, aye or no, one's approbation of, or dissent from, the most *peculiar* features of the teaching of the Tract writers. With them, as you well know, I have never agreed. Their views on many points (specially the Tract on Reserve) have appeared to me so dangerous, that, at all costs, I felt I must bear my feeble testimony against them in my Oxford sermons, &c. &c. Of late, also, they have seemed to me to advance at immense speed. Newman's view of Justification; the language of Tract 90, the 'British Critic,' &c., as to Rome; the craving after unity through *some* visible centre; the saying that old Rome was that centre (whereas I believe that to be central point of the old Papal lie, the seed of everything, the truly putting the Church *for* Christ, instead of showing it as full of Christ, the root of their *opus operatum* in baptism, transubstantiation, tradition, &c. &c.); the fearful doctrine of Sin after baptism, the whole tone about the Reformers, &c. &c.—all this has pained and grieved me so entirely, that I have felt daily obliged more and more, from love of the truth as I saw it, from love to our Church, whose principles and very life I believe this teaching threatens, with formality and Romanism on the one hand, and a colder formality and Dissent (by its revulsion), on the other, to take on all occasions a position of more direct opposition to the School than I had of old thought necessary; being content before to feel that, whilst I honoured their zeal, and was abashed by their holiness, and joined heartily in much Church truth they had brought forward, I was myself of another school of opinion and feeling; but now feeling that one must contend against what was

spreading so widely, and shedding the seeds of Romanism (look at Sibthorp and Wackerbarth—is one to add Bloxham and others?), on the one hand, and Dissent on the other (see the Bishop of Chester's Charge as an instance of this revulsion).

How can I, at such a moment, vote for Isaac, with the truth before me that *all* his voters will be men who wish to bear their testimony to their persuasion of the truth of these principles, with which Dr. Pusey's letter has identified him in this contest? Can I escape, at every sacrifice, voting against him? Will you write to me, Prevost, for our old love's sake, and answer this? Is it too late to implore you to withdraw him? Surely for the sake of the peace of the Church, he might most honourably withdraw. Pray consider this, and believe me to be ever your most affectionate old friend,

S. WILBERFORCE.

Archdn. S. Wilberforce to Archdn. R. I. Wilberforce.

Alverstoke, Nov. 30, 1841.

My dearest Robert,— . . . I see a good deal of Croker here. He is very kind and very amusing. The most singular thing is that in all his remarks on men, &c., he is very kind. I really think that I have never heard him make an unkind remark on any one. He is very attentive at Church, &c. I have just had a most scurrilous attack on me, in a low vulgar style, published at Gosport—as a bigot, &c. &c.—in the shape of a 'Letter.' I hope it will do no harm. It shows that the Dissenters *feel* the Church, I trust. But such things pain me.

I hope you will not go up to vote for Williams. Viewing the tendency of that party as I do—Reserve, the Roman bias, specially in their craving after unity through some visible centre (say the Holy See), the very central lie, as I believe, of the whole Popish falsehood, &c.—I fear that after Pusey's letter I must, if it comes to a poll, vote against him. I do not believe that he has a chance; and his voters will merely register their names as supporters of the Tractarian party. This, I mean, is the way in which it strikes me. . . .

And again on December 16, 1841 :—

My dearest Brother,— . . . I have promised to vote for

Garbett. It seems to me that, at present, the Tract men are threatening us with 2 great dangers: (1) Romanizing our best men of one tone; (2) driving into utter Low Church our best men of the other. I think it necessary to give them the strongest check we can, and especially needful, if we *do* hold really Church views, strongly to testify against their modification of them, in order to prove to young men that they have another choice than between *them* and the Low Church. In this view no feelings of gratitude to the men for past service, &c. can come in. The more I feel *that*, and the more I feel the need of not being contented with the mere Evangelical scheme, the more I feel the need of hoisting the *Church* flag, even at the cost of any sacrifice. And to vote against dear Prevost's Isaac is not a little one. . . .

I am busy from 7 A.M. till 12 at night, but ever your much loving brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Mr. W. E. Gladstone.

Alverstoke Rectory, Dec. 19, 1841.

My dear Gladstone,—The arguments for your proposal are evident and strong; but, on the other side, are one or two difficulties which make me hesitate. They are chiefly these:—

1. I have said that I shall vote for Garbett. Now if your proposal goes forward, and is accepted by Williams' committee (who, I am told, will be 3 to 500 behind if it comes to a poll), and not accepted by Garbett's, it will be putting G. in a very disadvantageous position. Is this fair in one who has promised his vote?

2. Is it not really giving a triumph to y^e^ one party for *both* now to be withdrawn? Yet I am assured a large majority is assured to G., if G. is identified with *no* party. But as W. *is* identified with a party, and therefore objected to, it is not a fair drawing of 2 equal candidates. If G. were a party man on the other side, there could be no keen objection to his withdrawal. I have not time to-day, with 4 services, to weigh these points. I will write with a final answer, if possible, to-morrow. . . .

(*Private.*)

Alverstoke Rectory, Dec. 20, 1841.

My dear Gladstone,—I feel upon the whole unable to add my name to your address; but this decision is from motives of a merely personal nature which appear to me to be imperative, and do not involve the least opinion either way as to its expediency or inexpediency, or any wish that you may not succeed in your charitable endeavour.

(*Confidential.*)

I have no hesitation in mentioning to *you* the ground of this decision. For reasons which it would be too long to state, but which receive their force from a recent communication from my Bishop on the subject of this election, I felt scarcely able to sign your address without seeking his advice. His opinion is so very strong against my doing so, that in the relation I stand to him, and being in some uncertainty myself, I feel hardly at liberty in a matter not of direct duty to go counter to it.

You will let me say, because it is not the empty assurance of a courteous refusal, that it has given me more pain not to fall in with such a plan when suggested by you than you can readily believe. I shall be deeply interested in the issue; will you let me have a single line saying what you do? Ever, my dear Gladstone, believe me to be most sincerely your's,

S. WILBERFORCE.

How keenly Mr. Gladstone regretted the Archdeacon's refusal to join in the address recommending the withdrawal of both candidates may be seen from his reply to the foregoing:—

Mr. W. E. Gladstone to Archdeacon S. Wilberforce.

(*Private.*)

Whitehall, D. 22, '41.

My dear Wilberforce,—I need hardly express to you that I am sorely disappointed by your declining to sign. The fact that the day has come, when you are conscientiously restrained

from lending a hand to a plan of pacification in an hour of extreme need, is one among a hundred symptoms of the times that make the heart heavy. At the same time I cannot fail to perceive that nothing can be more single and upright than your motives, nothing more kind than your manner of giving them expression.

But I hope that those who are impeding what I should once have presumed to anticipate they would have been the first to undertake, or, if not, then to encourage, have well considered the issue to which they may intend that matters should be driven.

Amidst the stunning events of the day I can hardly discern anything, except the duty to seek solid peace and to repress the bitterness of spirit which is so apt to break forth from within. One lesson at least I have learned from it: to relinquish that somewhat boastful form in which I have often allowed myself to conceive of our history, our condition, and our prospects; yet not in endeavouring to substitute a less buoyant mood, to bate any jot of heart or hope.

I do not know, with respect to the immediate matter in hand, that I am less sanguine than when I last wrote. By to-morrow's post I hope our circular will be sent out; and I have had the opportunity of learning that the course taken is acceptable to persons of the highest authority. Believe me always most sincerely your's,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

The Archdeacon replied as follows:—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Mr. W. E. Gladstone.

(*Private.*)

Alverstoke Rectory, Dec. 27, 1841.

My dear Gladstone,—I cannot forbear thanking you for the friendly tone of your answer to my last letter. I sympathise, in truth, greatly in your feelings as to the threatening aspect of the atmosphere round us; and the angry tone of this present controversy is specially unworthy and offensive. I most earnestly hope that some mode of escape from its completion may yet open for us. I have no right to ask it, but if

you can spare me a few moments, when any more decided move is made, to let me know it, I shall be much obliged to you.

You do me, I believe, no more than justice in your estimate of the motives which have held me back on this occasion. I felt that having received much, until I had become incapable of receiving more, I should be employing that 'much' in a step I was not compelled to take, against the strongly expressed judgment of the person from whom I had received it —and he my Bishop. Ever, my dear Gladstone, believe me to remain most truly your's,

S. WILBERFORCE.

And again on December 29, Mr. Gladstone wrote :—

I am glad to say—and I think you will not be displeased to learn—that our address thrives beyond our expectations. About 170 members of Convocation have subscribed it ; and I expect that the number will pass two hundred by the end of the week.

But, indeed, since I last wrote to you the matter has taken a turn, in some degree new, which induces me to suppose it possible that with your feelings you may be disposed to reconsider your decision, and even your Bishop his inhibition. We did not at the outset think it fair to ask Bishops to subject themselves to the chance of a refusal. But a letter which I sent, by way of information only, to the Bp. of Salisbury, led to his signing the address, which the Bishop of Ripon has also done. The Bishop of Oxford likewise (without knowing these of his brethren had signed) has expressed a strong and warm concurrence, so that I rather expect he will sign ; and, if the Bishop of Exeter also concur, we shall have four of the only six English Bishops who are members of Convocation. . . .

The quality of our names is good, and they are sufficiently diversified. Of eleven persons (I think) who refuse on account of injustice to one or the other candidate, six think it unjust to Garbett and five to Williams. The total of refusals, I think, is 15. . . .

The Archdeacon was not to be moved from his position, as the following extract from the letter which closed the correspondence shows :—

Windsor Castle, Jan. 2, 1842.

My dear Gladstone,—The same reason still operates against my signing your address.

There is one comfort to me now, which there was not at first, in this matter, that with the support which your letter mentions the addition of my name would be of no value to your cause ; and at all events, therefore, I only lose the pleasure of co-operating with you. . . .

The close of the year 1841 was marked by a visit from Bishop Alexander and his family, who were *en route* for Jerusalem, by a visit from Mr. Whitehead, who was about to join Bishop Selwyn, as his chaplain, in New Zealand, by much reading of Anselm and St. Augustine, and by much preaching and close attention to parish work at Alverstoke.

On the first Sunday of the new year (1842) he was again at Windsor, where he met a party which interested him much, and of which he wrote to Miss Noel :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Alverstoke, Jan. 8, 1842.

All went on most pleasantly at the Castle : my reception and treatment throughout was (*sic*) exceedingly kind. The Queen and the Prince were both at church, as also was Lord Melbourne, who paid his first visit at the same time. The Queen's meeting with him was very interesting. The exceeding pleasure which lighted up her countenance was quite touching. His behaviour to her was perfect. The fullest attentive deference of the subject with a subdued air of ' your father's friend ' that was quite fascinating. It was curious to see (for I contemplated myself, at the moment, objectively and free from the consciousness of subjectivity) sitting round ' the

Queen's table,' (1) the Queen, (2) the Prince, (3) Lord Melbourne, (4) Archdeacon, (5) Lady F. Howard, (6) Baron Stockmar, (7) Duchess of Kent, (8) Lady Sandwich, in the evening, discussing Coleridge, German literature, &c. with (2), (3) and a little (4) and (6), who is a very superior man evidently. The remarks of (3) were highly characteristic, his complaints of '*hard words*,' &c. &c.; (2) showed a great deal of taste and interest in German and English literature, and a good deal of acquaintance with both. I had orders to sit by the Duchess of Kent at dinner, just opposite to (1) and (2); (3) sitting at (1)'s right; and the conversation, especially *after* dinner, was much more general, across the table, on etymology, &c.

During the rest of the month, and during February, he was chiefly in London, seeing much of Chevalier Bunsen, meeting the King of Prussia at Lambeth Palace, dining with Mr. T. Carlyle at Mr. F. D. Maurice's—'a very interesting evening;' visiting Dr. Kay (afterwards Sir J. Kay Shuttleworth) and inspecting his recently formed training-school for masters at Battersea; and also, in company with Mr. T. Acland, visiting the National Society's training-school at Stanley Grove (afterwards St. Mark's College), Chelsea, besides a number of other engagements; while the joint scheme of Prussia and England for the Jerusalem bishopric is again referred to in the following letter:—

Archdn. S. Wilberforce to Archdn. R. I. Wilberforce.

44, Cadogan Place, Feby. 2, 1842.

My dearest Robert,—. . . I have no fear about Prussia and the Protestants. I believe that if Archbishop Tenison [4] had been anybody else almost in creation from what he was, Prussia would even now be Episcopal and strengthening us in 1,000 ways by a visible unity, and by issuing true notions on the Sacraments, etc. Now, I see not the least symptom

[4] See note on page 198.

of an inclination *now* to say, 'Episcopacy is immaterial; let us fraternise.' I believe the truth is, they *are* Christians, are one with us in the living and invisible unity of the Church, the essence of which is union with Christ; but that they cannot prove it, or openly commune with us for lack of an organization. They are like spirits in the separate state, or like Dean Tucker's 'vehicular state.' I confess I feel furious at the craving of men for union with idolatrous, material, sensual, domineering Rome, and their squeamish anathematizing hatred of Protestant Reformed men. Will you read, if you have not read them, Maurice's 3 Letters to the 'Cursing Deacon?' They seem to me to be unanswerable. Have you read Hook's 'Reasons for subscribing,' etc.? I cannot make him out. Horrible thoughts will rush into one's mind as to the exact moment when that and the 'Moderation' sermon came out. It is utterly at variance with his 'nailing his colours to the mast,' etc. Yet it avows no change, no enlightenment; nay, it is, I think, self-contradictory. How he can laud Hope's pamphlet and yet approve of the Bp. is marvellous. As to Newman, etc., day by day I am more confirmed and enlarged in my views; but I have no *new* light. Dearest H. says that for three years I have indulged in the most un-Christian bitterness against them. *Record* says I countenance them. The two leading errors seem to me to be (1) the *authority* as to teaching with which they invest the early Fathers, which implies the greater *purity* of celibacy, that fearful lie which has destroyed the sanctity of married life and polluted every female mind in Italy, to say nothing of other consequences; (2) their craving after a visible centre of unity, from a belief that the Church is to us instead of an absent Christ, instead of a means of His true presence. But I must not run on thus. . . . As ever, my dearest Robert, believe me to be most affectly your's,

S. WILBERFORCE.

The publication of Archdeacon Manning's volume on the 'Rule of Faith' led to an inquiry as to his own views on the subject, which elicited the following reply :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss M. S. Elliott.

The Close, May 18, 1842..

My dear Friend,—Your question is not an easy one to answer in a single word. I believe the Bible, and the Bible only, to be the rule of faith; and I believe, that to bring this strongly and sharply out is a matter of the greatest moment. I think the *whole* school of the Tract writers fail here: that they speak, and seem to love to speak, ambiguously of the necessity of Tradition, &c. &c.—the tendency of all which (even if they do *not* mean what is positively erroneous) must be, I think, and is, (1) to lead men to undervalue God's word (a tendency on which I enlarged in one of my Oxford sermons); (2) to lead men to regard the Romish view of Tradition without suspicion and dread. Now to these objections, I do honestly think, some of my dear brother-in-law's statements are exposed, and I could not, therefore, have written as he has done; but when I have talked with him, I have found it difficult to fix him to any meaning beyond what all Churchmen hold. Putting *him*, therefore, aside, I believe I can explain, in a few words, what I mean.

The Bible being to *each one* of us *the* rule of faith; and being, as I believe, the very living word of God, it *will* speak straight to the heart of each one who uses faithfully whatever aids God has given him to understand it; these aids are, for the first, the teaching of the Holy Spirit to be obtained by earnest prayer; then the singleness of eye which belongs to sincerity in God's sight; and then, beyond these, all the external aids God gives each man, *i.e.* pious parents and pious friends to the child; and, to all, the guides and directors whom His providence has furnished. If a man then refuses to use these, he does refuse to study the Bible in God's way; and it is not because these are *plainer* than the Bible that therefore he must go to them to understand the Bible (a way in which the Tract people I think often speak), but that these are helps God has provided: glasses for weak eyes; which they will make use of if they are sincere, and which God will bless. Now of all these assistances of a material kind and external, and not inward and spiritual, there can be none so

great as the uniform and consenting judgment of all God's Saints upon the meaning of God's word; and wherever there is such a judgment, I do not see how any single man *can* set his own inference from God's word against their's. For instance, the Socinian understands certain texts in his way. We tell him he is heretical in doing so: he replies that we are. We say the plain meaning of the passage is against him: he retorts the charge on us. He asserts that he has sought for light and teaching as we have. Now, is it *not* a valid argument against this man to say:—All God's Saints have understood the passage as we do. The Creeds show that in the earliest times it was so understood, and you therefore are setting your private interpretation against the uniform interpretation of all ages; and who is likely to be led right, you in your private interpretation, or they in their universal one?

Thus while the Bible is the rule of faith; whilst every honest man who prays for God's Spirit will be led into essential truth; whilst this seems to me the important point to bring continually out: still, on the other hand, I think it most important to remember, that the meaning of the Scripture is in each place *one;* that no other meaning is *the* meaning; and that there is the highest conceivable improbability, that a meaning which suggests itself to one or two persons, be they Fathers or men of the 19th century, is *the right* meaning, if it differs from the meaning which God's Saints from the beginning have been led to attach to it. This, I think, is what our article means by calling the Church the keeper and witness of holy Scripture.—S. W.

Shortly afterwards, Mr. Trench having written to him respecting certain objections[5] brought against portions of his allegory, 'The Rocky Island,' he wrote as follows:—

[5] The *Record* newspaper had attacked 'The Rocky Island' as offering 'the *soupe maigre* of Popery instead of the sincere milk of God's Word.'

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. C. Trench.

Thank you for your friendly openness. My temper of mind, strongly craving sympathy, makes me sensitive to such gross misrepresentations. But still I am thankful to be told of them. If you thought that the falsehood did any real harm in any quarter, I could give you a copy I obtained the other day from Fosbery of a letter to him, which he had kept, written now some two years since, before, therefore, the change of Ministry, &c. &c., stating more strongly perhaps, than anything I have ever said or written since my separation from the Tract writers.

The letter to Mr. Fosbery referred to above was as follows :—

The Close, March 30, 1841.

My dear Friend,—I am truly obliged to you for your kind letter, and your remarks upon some of the 'Answers' in my little 'Rocky Island.' It is the part of true friendship to name such matters directly to oneself. The points you name shall receive my most careful revision previous to a new edition: since I sh[d] be truly sorry that any expressions of mine should tend in any quarter to spread the grievous doctrinal misapprehensions to which you refer. I need not tell you, who know me well, that I believe from my soul, that the clear and full bringing out before every son of Adam, whether child or adult, of the Person, Office, and Work of Christ, our only Saviour, and Him crucified, is the only foundation of true teaching. That I should dread to speak a word which should lead a single soul to look to his own good works, or repentance, or anything in himself, as in any sense, or under any reservation, the cause of his acceptance with God, and that I should fear no less to put any other thing, name, or notion, whether devised by man, or an abused ordinance of God, between Christ and the soul as the giver of all its life, the bestower of God's grace, and so the continuer no less than the author of its spiritual being. I believe that I hold these views as dear as my life, and as clearly as though they were written with a sunbeam. Anything, therefore, which can

raise in any pious mind a contrary impression must have been written by me incautiously; and probably in too ready a belief that the whole drift of the book, which is what children mainly learn by, made my views clear. But no such spots shall be left hereafter, if you will point them out to me.

I am not less surprised that you should find persons who identify my opinions with those of the 'Tracts for the Times.' This does indeed show the strength of prejudice. *You* have long known how widely I differ from them: but surely others might have known it also. My *general* tone is quite unlike their's; and against their peculiar views my protests have been neither single nor private. In the face of much condemnation from many friends, as having put myself needlessly forward, I have preached against them at the University and elsewhere, and made my sermons public. For the personal piety of the writers of the 'Tracts' I entertain the most unfeigned veneration: but I have other modes of learning doctrinal truth than imbibing it through these feelings; and God's Word seems to me to contradict the points peculiar to their teaching. It is true that I agree with them upon many points; but they are the points upon which (to name no others) manifestly Richard Hooker and Bishop Beveridge agreed with them also. They are not their *peculiarities*. My opinions indeed have been formed in a far different school. They are those of my beloved father, as I could prove, were it needful, from many written records of his judgment as to the tenor of my ministry, of which, during his late years, he was a most kind, but a close observer. But why do I say all this, which you well know? You know my dread of the 'Tract' doctrine of Reserve, of its coldness, and suppression, and earthly wisdom; you know my love and gratitude towards the memory of our great Reformers; you know my fear of robbing religion of its true spiritual character in the heart of the faithful man; you know my abhorrence of Rome, and of the result of Popish doctrine, that *caput mortuum* of piety, whether reached through the Papacy or any other system. I am indeed, on the conclusions of my reason and the convictions of my conscience, a decided and uncompromising Churchman. But it is because I believe the Church system is God's appoint-

ment for maintaining the life of God in the souls of men ; and I cannot, therefore, substitute a veneration for the instrument for that result for the sake of which the instrument is valuable.

You are quite at liberty to state that these are my views in any quarters in which you may think the statement useful. Though I cannot enter into personal controversy on such a subject, I have no wish to be misunderstood—I am ever y^rs very truly and affectly.—S. WILBERFORCE.

At this time Oxford was again disturbed in reference to Dr. Hampden. It has already been related how the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the Regius Professorship of Divinity, 1836, had led, not merely to strong remonstrances, but to the passing of a Statute limiting the exercise of his professional functions.

Since that time, however, the state of theological parties in the University had largely altered ; and, on the formation of the (then) new Theological Board, the Heads of Houses appointed Dr. Hampden its chairman ; *after* which they sought to free him from the old censure, and submitted to the Convocation a Statute for its repeal. Samuel Wilberforce was no friend to Dr. Hampden's views, and had voted for the censure in 1836, but the following reply to an inquiry from Mr. R. C. Trench as to his intended course on this occasion is such a striking example of his fairness of disposition and dislike of anything like party spirit, that, apart from its bearing on a very important subject, it would be unpardonable here to omit it. He wrote on June 1 :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. C. Trench.

As to Oxford my mind is not entirely made up ; but I strongly incline to go and vote against the Statute. My principal doubt is this :—by an *unopposed* Statute, Hampden was made chairman of the new Theological Board ; now how can we refuse him one voice amongst 5 in nominating select

preachers on the disqualification of heresy, and yet allow him to be Chairman of this Theological Board? It is not so much the absolute contradiction of this, as the look of party which it wears, that moves me. Yet the other reasons, w^h^ I need not recite, on the whole at present preponderate. Will you send me the upshot of what you hear and think about it?

Ultimately the Archdeacon did not vote at all, but the proposal to reverse the censure was lost by a majority of 334 to 219, the Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Phillpotts) voting in the majority.

The rest of the year was chiefly noticeable for his frequent preaching at Court, sometimes at the Pavilion, Brighton, sometimes at Claremont, and for a visit to the North in the autumn, in the course of which he spent a Sunday at Leeds. Traces now begin to appear of that which was subsequently so remarkable, namely the extreme rapidity with which Samuel Wilberforce was always able to prepare for any sermon or other public utterance. Several times during this year (1842) he was summoned quite unexpectedly, and at the close of the week, to attend and preach at Court on the approaching Sunday, allowing him barely time to arrive on the Saturday afternoon, with only the Sunday morning to write or finish his sermon; as, for example, is shown in the following entries in his diary:—

Sunday, February 27. The Pavilion, Brighton.—Finished sermon, and preached it. Much in prayer for a blessing. Interview with Prince after church: to publish and dedicate to the Queen. Walked with Anson, B. Lehzen, Stockmar, &c. Peel very civil about sermon, &c. All very kind. Baron Stockmar 'person acceptable.'

Sunday, July 10. Claremont.—Up at ¼ to 5 and wrote sermon; nearly finished by breakfast, ½ past 9. Lady Conroy, Lady Lyttelton, &c., all very agreeable. Came down and finished sermon. Preached it with interest. All kind

about it. Saw Prince of Wales and Princess. Read some very striking Rom. Cath. devotions—*Entretiens, &c., avec J. C. par Père Thomas*, translated from the Portuguese.

Under the self-same date, July 10, 1842, the Lady Lyttelton mentioned in the foregoing extract, who, from 1842 until 1850, was governess to the Queen's children, wrote as follows to her daughter, the Hon. Miss Lyttelton, describing most vividly the impression which his presence produced at Court:—

Claremont, July 10, 1842.

. . . The real delight of this visit is the presence of Archdeacon Wilberforce. I never saw a more agreeable man; and if such a Hindoo were to be found, I think he would go far to convert me and lead me to Juggernaut; so it is hard if all who know him are not altogether Christians sooner or later. And I need not add, for it is a necessary part of his character, that he never parades or brings forward his religious feelings. They are only the *climate* of all his mind; talents, knowledge, eloquence, liveliness, all evidently Christian. And it is very pleasant to observe the hearty respect and regard with which every one behaves to him. What good he has in his power—ten talents indeed.

And again, from Windsor Castle, in the same year Lady Lyttelton wrote:—

Archdeacon Wilberforce is gone, after preaching to us at morning service a most beautiful sermon; I was going to say the most beautiful sermon I ever heard, but that phrase means little. It was in manner and language the highest eloquence; and his voice and earnest simplicity all the time leave on one no wish except that one could remember every word, and, oh! practise every precept. The sermon we heard yesterday he wrote before breakfast, having come here quite unexpectedly. Everybody says he will be a bishop, and so he ought; but I should mourn over his leaving his present place, which brings such an influence as his to those who most want it from their situation and peculiar trials.

Similarity of subject will warrant the insertion of one more extract from a letter of the same writer, though of a date some two years later, viz. February 1844 :—

Just before church time the Queen told me that Archdeacon Wilberforce was going to preach, so I had my treat most unexpectedly—mercifully I could call it—for the sermon, expressed in his usual golden sweetness of language, was peculiarly practical and useful to myself—I mean, ought to be. 'Hold thee still in the Lord, and abide patiently upon Him,' was the text; and the peace, trust, and rest which breathed in every sentence ought to do something towards assuaging any and every worret, temporal and spiritual. There were some beautiful passages on looking forward into 'the misty future' and its misery, to a worldly view, and the contrary. The whole was rather the more striking from its seeming to come down so gently upon the emblems of earthly sorrow;[6] we are such 'a boundless contiguity of shade.'

There was a beautiful passage—I wish you could have heard it, because you could write it out—about growth in grace being greatest when mind and heart are at rest and in stillness; like the first shoot of spring, which is not forwarded by the storm or the hurricane, but by the silent dews of early dawn. Another upon the *melancholy* of human life, most beautiful because most true.

An entry or two from his diary during his Northern excursion may also be interesting :—

Friday, July 22.—To Bridlington, where the sea magnificent, and Marton, where I had not been for I think 18 years. *Then* always dreaming of life with my blessed Emily. *Now* Herbert by my desolate side, and life gone from me—like one of those broken on rocks,—but for the hope of Christ's mystical presence.

Sunday, July 24.—Morning, up betimes, private prayers. Hook's church. Service nobly performed; nothing which

[6] Referring to the mourning for Prince Albert's father.

offended me. Evening, Hook preached, mainly from notes (interweaving a discussion on Faith), on Elijah's flight—very good indeed in all points. People very attentive. Hook came to us to tea, very friendly.

And thus, with the usual parochial and archidiaconal employments, with much work at his 'History of the American Church,' and with the delivery of his annual Charge, the year 1842 drew to a close.

Early in 1843 occurred an incident connected with his position at Court which gave him the keenest gratification. The Vicarage of East Farleigh, near Maidstone, to which, in 1832, Lord Brougham, then Lord Chancellor, had presented his brother Robert, was now about to be again vacant, and Archdeacon Wilberforce, being at Claremont from the Saturday to the Monday, January 14–16, 'mentioned accidentally to Anson' his wish that it might now be given to his brother Henry, who held only the small benefice of Walmer, in Kent.

This was repeated to the Prince and the next morning Mr. Anson brought the Archdeacon the draft of a letter which the Prince had already written to Lord Lyndhurst, who was now Lord Chancellor, desiring, in the Queen's name and in his own, that the living might be so bestowed when vacant. The same evening the Archdeacon thus mentioned the circumstance in a letter to Miss L. Noel:—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Claremont, Sunday Evening [Jan. 15, 1843].

The Prince hearing quite incidentally that I should like to secure E. Farleigh (where poor Mr. Lutwidge is said to be just dying) for Henry, has written himself to the Lord Chancellor to say that it will be a great gratification to the Queen and himself if he will give it to Henry. . . . It will

be peculiarly pleasant to me being the channel of providing a sufficient living for H. . . . The Prince said in his note that his and the Queen's great reason was a wish to gratify Archd[n] S. W., who was, they knew, anxious to secure such a post for his brother. I have been preaching on 'Every man shall bear his own burden,' and trying as God made me able to speak with all possible plainness the great truth that each one of us is forming *a* character with which no other can intermeddle and which is *our* burden.

Of almost the same date is another letter from Claremont, which gives a vivid picture of his occupations and his feelings :—

Archdn. S. Wilberforce to Archdn. R. I. Wilberforce.

Claremont, Jan. 9, 1843.

My dearest Robert,—. . . I have had a very pleasant visit here : only 8 in party, so that one really sees the *dramatis personæ* near at hand. It is deeply interesting, as you may believe, getting ½ an hour of such an audience and on such subjects (yesterday on *Time*), with the hope that God will bless His own appointment in the ministry of His Church to His own good purpose. I hope, dearest brother, that you pray for me on these occasions that I may *do good* and not *get harm*. In some respects it seems to me that the temptations *decrease* from use to the scene ; but in others I am well aware that there is danger of one's not as keenly appreciating the temptation rather than of its losing its power. There may certainly, I think, be something wholesome in one's knowing that quantities of ill-natured things are said of one just because one is, as people think, thus put into a post of honour.

I am now writing in a carriage in w[h] they are sending me to a meeting of my clergy for this Rural Deanery, which has been long fixed for to-day, I promising to attend. It is the first of a set of 4terly meetings of the clergy, which I am promoting in the R. Deaneries ; and I mean to propose the Service and Holy Communion at its opening ; then

luncheon; then discussion;—to have them in Ember Weeks and to attend them, if possible, myself.

I am very anxious about your pamphlet.[7] I am afraid just now of its doing mischief, and would beg you to weigh my reasons. The new Bill saves all the Consistory Courts of the Bishops, with all their spiritual powers, power of costs and of enforcing them, as they now are, except that it takes defamation and brawling in the churchyard out of the catalogue of spiritual offences. . . .

I should have mentioned that the Queen and Prince have given me a very handsome silver inkstand as a Christmas present 'from V.R. and Albert.' They have been especially kind this time. My paper is spent, so I must end, and am ever your most aff. brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

Of the intercourse between the Prince and himself at this period his entry under *Monday, March* 6, after a Sunday at Claremont, may serve as a specimen :—

After breakfast, with the Prince for ¾ of an hour, talk about Sunday. Told him that I thought 'Book of Sports' did more than almost anything to shock the English mind, &c. He urged English want of amusements for common people of an innocent class—no *gardens.* In Coburg, with 10,000 inhabitants, 32 gardens frequented by different sorts of people, who meet and associate in them. 'I never have heard a real *shout* in England. All my German servants marry because they say it is so dull here; nothing to interest—good living, good wine, but there is nothing to do but to turn rogue or marry,' &c. He very intelligent, right-minded and remarkably pleasing. 'The Queen wishes to give you this print of the Princess. The picture was by ——, and was very successful, and it has been lithographed at Paris,' &c.

In July Archdeacon Wilberforce, being engaged to speak at a public meeting in London, in support of a scheme then proposed for Factory Education, ap-

[7] A pamphlet which Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce contemplated on Church Discipline. See *infra,* page 230.

plied to his friend Dr. Hook for information on the subject in general, and specifically for any facts respecting the disposition of the labouring classes and as to the means by which the Church might meet existing evils. The reply of the Vicar of Leeds was such as to draw from the Archdeacon the strongest statement which exists among his earlier papers on the subject of Disestablishment; and inasmuch as the rejoinder can hardly be fully appreciated, except after reading the letter which elicited it, the two are given *in extenso* :—

Dr. W. F. Hook to Archdeacon S. Wilberforce.

Vicarage, Leeds, July 5, 1843.

My dear Wilberforce,—I am not aware that I can help you to any facts beyond those which you will find in the public reports, only warning you that Lord Ashley's statements are one-sided and exaggerated.

As far as my opinion goes, it is a crying sin in the Church not to undertake the education of the people entirely into [*sic*] her own hands. And I really do not see how the Church can fairly ask the State to give it money for the purpose of giving a Church education when the money is to be supplied by Dissenters and infidels, and all classes of the people, who, according to the principles of the Constitution, have a right to control the expenditure. The State can only, if consistent, give an infidel education ; it cannot employ public money to give a Church education because of the Dissenters, nor a Protestant education because of the Papists ; and have not Jews, Turks, and infidels as much a right as heretics to demand that the education should not be Christian? In saying this, I do not, of course, mean to advocate the cause of infidel education, but I would have the Government see what the difficulty is, and not attempt to educate at all.

If we are to educate the people in Church principles, the education must be out of Church funds. I would not have the State take away the funds of the Church, but I would have the Church make an offer of them. We want not proud

Lords, haughty Spiritual Peers, to be our Bishops. Offer four thousand out of their five thousand a year for the education of the people, and call upon the more wealthy of the other clergy to do the same, and a fund is at once provided. Let Farnham Castle and Winchester House and Ripon Palace be sold, and we shall have funds to establish other Bishoprics. Let the Church do something like this, and *then* the Church will live in the hearts of the people who now detest her.

The people in agricultural districts are generally indifferent about the Church,—lukewarmness is their sin; the upper and middle classes uphold her;—but in the manufacturing districts she is the object of detestation to the working classes. Among this class I have many friends, zealous and enlightened Churchmen; and from them, and the persecutions they endure, I know the feeling which exists. The working-classes consider themselves to be an oppressed people. They think that they can only obtain the right and importance they desire by exhibiting their strength; they attend public meetings and rejoice in an occasional riot, not so much for the sake of any mischief to be immediately done, as to let their oppressors, as they think their superiors, see their strength.

Such men as Lord Ashley, whom they laugh at and regard only as a fool for forsaking the policy of his order, only make them feel the more indignant at their wrongs. They consider themselves to be a Party in the State,—they, many of them, are noble and enthusiastic lovers of their Party. They place Party in the stead of the Church; and they consider the Church to belong to the Party of their oppressors: hence they hate it, and consider a man of the working-classes who is a Churchman to be a traitor to his Party or Order,—he is outlawed in the society in which he moves. Paupers and persons in need may go to church on the principle of living on the enemy; but woe to the young man in health and strength who proclaims himself a Churchman. I continually expatiate on the blessedness of being persecuted to keep my young men firm, for they have a sore trial of it.

Now, such being the case, the Church must try for God's sake to win the people by making a great sacrifice. We

want not the State to take our funds and expend them, but the Church to use its own funds and to say, 'We will educate the people in our own way out of our own funds. Till something like this is done, it is useless to invent schemes of Factory improvement.

You see I am almost a Radical, for I do not see why our Bishops should not become poor as Ambrose or Augustine, &c. &c., that they may make the people really rich. Your's very truly,

W. F. HOOK.

It was to this energetic outburst that Archdeacon Wilberforce replied thus :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Rev. Dr. Hook.

Alverstoke, July 29, 1843.

My dear Dr. Hook,—I must thank you for your kind and full reply to my questions; with which I should not have felt that I had any right to trouble you, except on public grounds.

The picture you set before me is, indeed, a sad one. What is before us if this spirit be, as you suppose, so widely spread, God knows. It is clear, at least, that all which is precious to us, as a nation and a Church, is to pass through a searching storm. But I should not deal honestly with you, if I did not strongly express my dissent from your proposed remedies. I do *not* believe that the Church ought to strip herself bare as you propose. I do *not* think that this would be the way to regain a hold on the affections of our people. I *do* think that we 'want Spiritual Peers.' It seems to me, that such steps as you propose would be wrong in themselves, useless for the end you desire, and fatal in their consequence.

I see no reason why the Bishops' palaces should be sold which would not equally apply to the halls of our squires and the palaces of our princes. It seems to me that your instances of rich men making *themselves* poor, living in *self*-denial for others, giving up well-nigh all for their brethren, as God gives them grace and opportunity—that these are the instruments by which to effect what you desire; but that to strip a class,

to impoverish our Bishops and sell their palaces, would only be the hopeless career of revolution. There always has been, I suppose, poverty; always want; yet God has ordained differences of rank, and intended His Church to pervade all ranks, as she does with us. The (I repeat) voluntary labours, charities, and *self*-emptying of those specially called to them, seem to me to be *the* means of effecting your object; and a general loud and earnest call, for Christ's sake, on true Christian principles, to all who have wealth, to give of it gladly and liberally to their brethren, seems to me the way to obtain funds, not the sale of our Bishops' lands, or the destruction of their palaces.—Ever believe me to be, my dear Dr. Hook, very truly your's,

S. WILBERFORCE.

In the month of May Dr. Pusey preached his famous sermon on the Holy Eucharist before the University of Oxford. By some it was regarded as teaching Transubstantiation; by others Consubstantiation; and the Margaret Professor of Divinity, Dr. Faussett, at once demanded a copy of it to be submitted to the Vice-Chancellor—Dr. Wynter, the President of St. John's College—who proceeded to nominate a Board[8] to consider its doctrinal statements. The course taken by the Board was not calculated to diminish the party-spirit then existing. The Statute under which the Board was appointed gave the accused the right to claim a hearing in his own defence. Dr. Pusey demanded to be heard, but his demand was rejected; and on June 2 (the sermon was preached only on May 14) the sermon was condemned without any specification either of the grounds of objection or of the passages deemed unsound, and the preacher was suspended from preaching in the University pulpit for

[8] The 'Six Doctors' who composed this Board were Dr. Wynter, Dr. Faussett, Dr. Ogilvie, Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, Dr. Hawkins, Provost of Oriel, Dr. Symons, Warden of Wadham, and Dr. Jelf, Canon of Christ Church, of whom at least four, if not five, were energetic anti-Tractarians.

two years. This high-handed proceeding roused a perfect whirlwind of opposition alike within and without the University. The 'British Critic'[9] attacked the 'Six Doctors' in one of its keenest and most brilliant articles. No fewer than 230 non-resident members of Convocation, including Dr. Hook and Mr. Gladstone, together with a large majority of the residents, sought permission to address the Vice-Chancellor on the question, but in vain, for Dr. Wynter was immovable, and the sentence was carried out. Upon this subject Archdeacon S. Wilberforce wrote thus to the Rev. R. Walker,[1] of Wadham College, with whom now, and for several years afterwards, he kept up an active correspondence on all University proceedings. It is noticeable how entirely Archdeacon Wilberforce limits his remarks to the sermon itself, and adds not a word upon the proceedings taken with respect to it, or the indignation and excitement which they had caused :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. Walker.

Claremont, July 16, 1843.

My dear Walker,—You have, indeed, a right to any answers I can send you, after your very kind and interesting communications to me. I would, however, rather talk over than write about Pusey's sermon, because I do not think that I can, without more time than you would wish me to take, *write* my *full* opinion about it. It does *not* seem to me at all to put forward the Transubstantiation view. Its main evil, I think, is a sort of misty exaggeration of the whole truth, which is very likely to breed in others direct errors. It certainly seems to me to be in *tone* un-Anglican. Moreover, I think some of the unqualified quotations from the Fathers, adopted

[9] See Article entitled 'The Six Doctors' in the *British Critic* for July 1843.

[1] Reader in Experimental Philosophy in the University of Oxford 1839–1862. Mr. Walker had been Mr. S. Wilberforce's private tutor in mathematics during his undergraduateship.

as they are by Puscy, quite objectionable; just as many orthodox but uncareful expressions of the ante-Nicene Fathers would have been condemned as tendency to heresy, after the rise of Arianism had shown the danger of using them in a true sense. I have not the sermon here to refer to, but such expressions as having 'on your very lips the blood of Christ,' &c. &c., are of the sort I mean.

But my main objection to the doctrine of the sermon is on the connection of the remission of sins with the 'Eucharist.' This seems to me to involve 2 very important errors. First, the whole view denies, I think, the *forgiven state* of the justified man, breaks down the one great act of forgiveness into a number of acts of forgiveness, and so *per contra* denies the true root of *Sin*, resolving it into special *acts* of sin. The whole view seems to me a denial of the doctrine of justification by faith as explained in the Epistle to the Romans, and adopted by our Church. Then ii^ndly^, this appears to me directly opposed to our xxxi^st^ Article. It seems that making the Atoning Sacrifice begin at the institution of the 'Eucharist,' is intended to continue it to every celebration, and that this is directly contrary to the Article. These views, I take it, are almost your's. There seems to me to be in the 'Eucharist' the *seal* of Remission, not the *act* of Remission. Ever, my dear Walker, believe me to be aff^ly^ your's,

S. WILBERFORCE.

To his brother Robert, who consulted him on the book which he was about to publish on 'Church Discipline,'[2] he wrote:—

Archdn. S. Wilberforce to Archdn. R. I. Wilberforce.

Pavilion, Sep. 10, 1843.

My dearest Brother,— . . . I do not very well know what to say as to your work on Church Discipline. The more I have thought over the matter, the more it seems to me that

[2] This was subsequently published under the title of *Church Courts and Church Discipline.* By R. I. Wilberforce, Archdeacon of the East Riding. Murray, London.

it was providentially intended, that discipline, in the strictest sense of that word, should be the restraint of the early Church, and that it should gradually die out as the Church approached maturity, or rather, turn from a formal and external rule to an inner curb on the spirit—should run into the opening of God's Word, and its application to the individual soul and life.

This does not apply to the single power of pronouncing who are and who are not in communion with her, and therefore in its simplest form to excommunication; but it would apply to everything else. And you, I think, contemplate much besides this. It does not seem to me, that the points I named to you in conversation, as not *made good* in your argument, have come more strongly to me, as proved since. But having named them, I will not bore you with them.

I was summoned here yesterday, and except the Duchess of Kent and her suite, and Sir R. Peel, am the only stranger. The Queen and Prince seem delighted with their trip in all ways. They go on Tuesday to Hastings, etc., and thence over to Ostend, and possibly to Brussels. . . .

The immediate occasion of his brother's book was a Bill then before the House of Commons, entitled 'The Ecclesiastical Courts Bill,' following up two Bills which had already become law, viz. one which had provided that the same forms should attend the execution of all wills, whether relating to real or personal property, and the other which substituted the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for the old Court of Delegates. But the Archdeacon's book took a wider range than that of the immediate controversy, and contained not merely a very able review of the then condition of the Church Courts, but also of the whole Scriptural argument as to Church discipline generally, and particularly as to excommunications, with an elaborate discussion of the subject of Church legislation and of the revival and definition of the rights of Convocation.

A few months after he wrote:—

Archdn. S. Wilberforce to Archdn. R. I. Wilberforce.

Railroad. En route for Surrey, Dec. 18, 1843.

Dearest Robert,— . . . I do not agree with you as to the —in fact—impossibility of substituting the Church for Christ. Indeed, as I speak of it, I believe it to be *the* prominent danger, amongst the many, of the Tract system. The Church, I say, *separated from the head* is substituted for Him! I refer to such passages as, *e.g.* that in one of Newman's sermons, where he is dealing with the case of one in dejection under the sense of sin, where he says:—'It is true you can have no assurance; there is no second Laver in which you can wash; but still you need not despair. You are still in the Church, and that is something. Go on using her ordinances in the hope that perhaps, after all, you will find you have life in you,' etc. I quote from memory, and do not pretend to give the words. But I feel sure that I do give the *idea*, that to such a stricken soul there is no mention of THE Healer, of His true presence, of His having compassion on the ignorant and on those out of the way, etc. I do feel sure that this passage and many like it are not of the New Testament tone, are not like the Epistles. Your illustration, my dearest brother, seems to me faulty in this very point; we can have *no other* communication with the sun but in the sunshine; but in the secrets of the New Life, there is, I doubt not, a close personal intercourse between each soul and Christ; and we must not for this place our being in one body. I think that Romanism does this eminently; and I continually feel that the 'Plain Sermons' and Newman, &c. do it also. . . .

Hitherto almost every incident which has called for mention, and nearly all the letters which have required insertion, have been such as to exhibit the gentler side of Samuel Wilberforce's character. Certain of his criticisms, indeed, on the views and teaching of the Tractarian School, and notably his firmness in resisting the efforts of his dearest friends to induce him to support

Mr. Isaac Williams in the contest for the Oxford Poetry Professorship, have already shown that in him the desire to please others was by no means unbalanced by firmness and tenacity in holding to fixed convictions.[3] A letter of this period, of which a copy remains in his copying-book, serves also to show that, when necessary, he could rebuke sharply, and that the element of self-assertion, without which no public man can hold his own, already co-existed in him with his habitual consideration for others. The occasion needs little explanation. More than once we have seen Samuel Wilberforce charged with a leaning to the Oxford School, which his accusers regarded as a desertion of the principles of his education. Now, it happened that one with whom he had been in frequent intercourse, and who was not his senior in years, had written to him in a tone of somewhat lofty congratulation at finding that he (the Archdeacon) was not so justly chargeable on this score as he (the writer) had believed. The name of the clergyman to whom it was addressed is for obvious reasons suppressed :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to the Rev. —— ——.

Alverstoke Rectory, Sep. 25, 1843.

My dear —— ——,—I cannot forbear expressing to you the pleasure which the friendliness of your tone, in the letter I have just received from you, gave to me. I thank you, too, sincerely, for the promise of your prayers. Our early acquaintance, the affectionate intercourse of so many years between my father and your grandfather, and my firm conviction of your piety and zeal—all this made the tone of your letter gratifying to me. I could not, therefore, receive it in silence, because this would seem cold, unfriendly, and repul-

[3] The reader may be reminded of the vivid description of his interview with the Irvingite emissaries given in his letter of April 13, 1836—pages 99, 100.

sive. Yet, upon the whole, it would have been far more easy for me to have received it in silence; for I cannot express to you the pleasure it gave me, and yet be silent as to the pain.

It pained me then, I will say, deeply, to find that you had allowed yourself, without foundation, to entertain suspicions of the fidelity of a brother minister of Christ's Gospel, to 'judge' him needlessly and uncharitably, to harbour such suspicions and evil judgments, although the easy course of looking at my University sermons, my Ordination sermon, or my last Charge, all of which in successive years have dealt plainly and strongly with the mistaken views to which you refer, might have undeceived you; and now, when accidentally you are led to perceive your want of charity, instead of feeling that you had done wrong, and fallen under the condemnation of St. James (cap. iii. v. 1), and so being led to suspect the soundness of those views which had led you into this evil, merely writing to me almost to congratulate me on having been replaced in your good opinion. Indeed, my dear friend, all this does look to me like a most fearful want of humility; and, as there can be no safe walking after Christ our Lord without a deep and true humility, I cannot but, in Christian faithfulness, endeavour to put you on your guard.

Let me tell you also, in all kindness, that in the affectionate exhortations which end your letter, and which the pen of an aged Bishop might have written to a young deacon, I trace, even amidst all their affection, the selfsame spirit. Such a spirit is ever the snare of men, who, like you, are possessed of shining talents, are fond of action, are thrown into busy life, and take a prominent part in their own province of society. It leads them to love singularity, to trample on rules, to have little respect for those above them, to assume a tone of superior age, wisdom, and spirituality, in their intercourse with others; it injures, above all things, the holiness and true peace of their own spirits. From such evils, my dear brother, may God of His great mercy keep us ever free.

I should be truly glad to talk over with you frankly the grave points of difference to which you allude. Neither I, nor, I dare say, you, have time to write about them. To me your fraternising with Arians, and encouragement of division,

appears to be eminently unscriptural. That which seems to you the narrowness of bigotry, I esteem the will of the God of Order. But as I know you would converse from a desire of learning the truth, and not from a love of disputing, I should be truly glad to talk over these things fully. Should you ever be in my neighbourhood, you will, I trust, let me see you. In the meantime, you will receive, I am sure, in the spirit of friendship, the frank statement of my feelings. May the God of all grace bless and keep us both, and lead us day by day into His hidden truths. Ever, my dear —— ——, believe me to be very truly your's,

S. WILBERFORCE.

P.S.—I should have added that I am not appointed tutor to the Prince of Wales.

The year 1844 passed amid much the same occupations as the preceding. Its principal incidents, so far as Archdeacon Wilberforce was concerned, were the completion and publication of the 'History of the American Church,' which he had had long in hand, and his attendance at the York meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; the only matter which requires a word of special notice is his vote at Oxford towards the end of the year. The occasion was that of the election of a Vice-Chancellor in the room of Dr. Wynter, the President of St. John's College, whose term of office expired in October; when Dr. Symons, the Warden of Wadham, was nominated to succeed him. It was a nomination which could not fail to excite opposition, for Dr. Symons had been one of the 'six doctors' who had condemned Dr. Pusey without a hearing; and the interest excited was shown by the fact that the unprecedented number of 1,065 members of Convocation voted on the day of election, October 10. On this occasion Archdeacon S. Wilberforce once more separated himself from his brother

Robert and his friend Sir G. Prevost, and supported Dr. Symons. Dr. Hook did the same, although he had originally intended to oppose Dr. Symons, alleging as his reason for change (in a published letter of October 4) that it was practically impossible for any one to oppose the nomination without identifying himself with the extreme Romanizing party represented by Mr. Ward.[4] To this consideration it was doubtless owing that Dr. Symons was elected by so large a majority as that of 882 to 183.

In October also he was appointed by the Archbishop of York to be Sub-Almoner to the Queen.

A few letters, which illustrate either his occupations or his feelings, are here given :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Windsor Castle, April 4, 1844.

My dearest Sister,—Many thanks to you for your very kind note. Yes, I quite know all those spring feelings. It is the hardest time of all the year. SHE loved it so. She opened in it so like some sweet flower. Always was I looking forward to it. Now I never look on to it. It seems so indifferent what it is; all the short halting places in life are swept away. If I could always look on to the end with anything like a comparatively increased singleness of eye! But it is most sad going home. If I went home to her, it was beyond all words. If I went home *with* her, I got apart to see her meet her children. And now—but I ought not to sadden you.

I am come here for to-morrow. The King and Queen of the Belgians are here. How much at such a time I wish there were some *rule* of fasting. At home one can do it easily; but here I hardly know what is right. To be at all singular would be wrong certainly, yet I fear our not fasting must scandalize good Roman Catholics like the Queen of the Belgians. I opened yesterday Pusey's translation (just out) of Avrillon's

[4] See next chapter.

mode of keeping Lent, with an introduction by Pusey. I think it is fuller of sad and humiliating bits of superstition than anything of his I have yet seen. How very sad this is. I must dress for dinner; first saying Good-bye to my dearest sister, who knows that I am ever her own brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

The next letter gives a pleasing picture of his London engagements :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Athenæum, Monday, May 6 [1844].

My dearest Sister,— . . . Thank God I am much better. I was able to preach yesterday morn without suffering from it; and though at night I still suffer a good deal, still the attack is passing off. How do your words go to my heart about long illness, and silence, and separation from all things. May God bless you, my dearest sister, and may His supporting presence be, as it has always been, very nigh indeed unto you. Indeed I do not know how I could bear so long a trial; but HE could make even such weakness as mine able to endure it if it were His will.

When I come in this way to London I have always been to my Bishop's, and there I meet the Surrey clergy at dinners; then there are a certain number of charity sermons I must preach for them, and that keeps me here for the Sundays. Then there are school examinations, &c. &c., all of which come off at this same time; so that all these things together seem to make a cause for being sometimes here. Yesterday I preached for a Southwark institution at St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, in the morn^{g}; saw Maurice for a little while after morn^{g} service; then went to Westminster Abbey service for the afternoon; dined at William's, and went with Fosbery in the evening to Margaret Street Chapel. I shall never go again. All was so *odd* as to provoke the attention to separate details, instead of the true devotional purpose. Oakeley's sermon was poor and barren in the extreme. The singing beautiful; one Old Version Psalm to an old Gregorian tune quite marvellously beautiful.

To-day my day has been this. Breakfast at Sir Rob.

Inglis', where was a German Yankee full of all prison schemes from Columbia. Then to ——'s to settle about the new picture,[5] which is to be standing instead of sitting. Then to the Athenæum, meeting Manning. Then to Grosvenor Square to meet Kennaway, whom I missed; and must return to Athenæum to meet the Bishop of Exeter and Manning for a discussion, (1) as to promoting the ordination of men of the middle class; (2) the present state of the law as to the obligation of clergymen burying schismatics, heretics, evil livers, &c. Then to the Academy Exhibition, open to-day; there with Manning and Fosbery till ¼ to 5. Magnificent pictures by Landseer. One, a star-and-moonlight lake, with a red-deer swimming over, his nose white and almost bright in the moonbeams, to fight another vast stag waiting for him on the other side. Some beautiful Turners and Stanfields, &c. Then found by C. Kennaway as I return to Athenæum, and drive with him, Lord Harrowby, and Lady Frances, to see *the* monument[6] at Lambeth, which is very good, chaste, and severe. Now return here and scribble off this to my dear sister. I am going to dine at Sir R. Inglis', and then sleep at James Street. To-morrow I go to Alverstoke to marry one of my parishioners—to whom I first administered the Holy Eucharist—who is a Sunday-school teacher, and much wished I should marry her. On Wednesday I am at a Chapter at Winchester, and come up here in the even[g]. Thursday, at the festival of the Sons of the Clergy. Sunday, 2 sermons in Southwark. Friday, go with Maurice to see Carlyle.

The post is actually going. May God bless you, dearest sister.

From your own brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

To which may be added the following extract from a letter to the same :—

[5] A little before he had written to Miss L. Noel :—'I am sitting to Richmond. I think I told you he offered to retouch the old picture. When it came to the point he said it was impossible, I was so altered, forehead enlarged, nose straightened, &c. &c. But he said, "Let me repair the wrong by a new one." This he is taking: very unlike the old.'

[6] That to his father, now in Westminster Abbey.

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Lavington, June 12, 1844.

I rather thought I should have heard from you *yesterday*. Oh, what a picture it was of life, coming *here* as I came yesterday instead of *that* day here which seemed to give me life in possession. I spent much time alone yesterday night, after all were gone in, in that churchyard, and came home quite quiet. Life here is so unlike my life anywhere else. I was up alone on the hill-side between six and seven this morning, and anything more lovely you cannot conceive. The slanting sun was throwing its brightness from behind me on the glorious prospect, far up into Surrey, Albury, the Hog's-back, Leith Hill, &c. &c., and all very distant country looks so beautiful: a sort of delectable mountain-feeling hangs about it. I suppose it is the secret instinct after the land which is very far away which then stirs within one. All nature is such a mere parable of the unseen that one seems often now to have been like a child who read the parable only for the story, and reality looks in at last in the shape of idealism.

I shall leave at Jacob's a little 'Augustine' you will accept 'from a brother.' On Friday I shall, please God, be again at Alverstoke, and just now am in such exhausting work as I have never known.

Of the British Association meeting he wrote from Bishopthorpe, on September 29, to Mr. R. C. Trench :—

I have had a very pleasant visit here. The Geological Section has very great charms for me, and a long discussion between Forbes and Hopkins on the law of Glacier Movement, and Liebig on Agricultural Chemistry, have much interested me. Liebig and Forbes, both of whom are guests here, are singularly pleasing men. Besides these, we have Everett (the American), Lord Northampton, Peacock, Brewster, Murchison, Sedgwick, Bishop of Ripon, my brother Robert, &c. &c., so that our home party has much of interest. There has been an admirable debate between the Dean of

York and Sedgwick: Dean Cockburn attacking Geology as anti-Mosaic cosmogony, and Sedgwick upsetting him in a most smashing rejoinder.

The month of October was spent chiefly in Yorkshire, and on the 26th he attended a meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, at which the Earl of Carlisle was in the chair, who thus records in his diary the impression made by the Archdeacon's speech :—

October 26.—Arrived at York. Took the Chair at the meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. I gave rather a flat account of our tour on Lake Huron; but soon came Samuel Wilberforce, who made a speech of two hours, combining, as I should imagine, the qualities of his father, Macaulay, and Ezekiel. It produced immense effect, and some of its pictures of our national neglect of religion were tremendous. The voice and delivery exceedingly good. I had much talk with him in the evening at Bishopthorpe, and liked him excessively. He praised Arnold; thought his bitterness was so vehement that it must have been superficial; thinks he had no defined system on religious subjects, which has made his pupils liable to become Tractarians.'[7]

The annexed letter from Mr. Gladstone, acknowledging the receipt of a copy of the 'History of the American Church,' now just out, will be read with interest, and its concluding remarks especially noted :—

Mr. W. E. Gladstone to Archdeacon S. Wilberforce.

Whitehall, Oct. 31, '44.

My dear Wilberforce,—I found your kind note and the volume on the American Church awaiting me when I returned to town on Monday, and I paid your book the only honour in my power, namely, to give it the first turn, which enables me to assure you that I have read the greater part of it with

[7] Extracts from Journals kept by George Howard, Earl of Carlisle. Selected by his sister, Lady Caroline Lascelles. For private circulation only. Page 14.

much interest and pleasure, and, unless it be my own fault, with not less instruction. The picture is, indeed, a very striking one; and most painful, in particular, as showing the exhausting power upon the inner life of quasi-establishment such as that which prevailed in Virginia, when its evils are not neutralized by a full Church organization. Always very sincerely your's,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

And the following letter, with its vivid sketch of his interests and engagements as the year 1844 neared its termination, may fitly close the present chapter. Its picture of the Court Chaplain travelling in November through the Saturday night at the tail of a goods'-train, and crossing the Solent on the Sunday morning, in order to be in time to preach at Osborne, and writing his sermon at intervals on the way, may well be regarded as unique:—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Railroad, Saturday Night, Nov. 19, 1844.

Dearest Sister,—I *will* write at once rather than leave you longer without hearing from me. Day after day this has been a vexation to me. But I have been moving about and incessantly occupied, and had a cold, abridging my nights and mornings. I left home on Tuesday; went to London to attend a meeting at Mr. Kingscote's about restoring, if possible, the Order of Deacons and getting a sort of Subdeacons' Order instituted. I was very anxious to be at this meeting, as it is so very important a matter for the Church; and here all those were moving in it who were supposed to be the people likely to suspect such a move of a Popish tendency. There was a large gathering, Lord Howard, Colquhoun, Harding, of Blackfriars, Burgess, Bonamy Price, Sir George Grey, Lord H. Cholmondeley, &c.

(I go on for a few moments from my railroad scrawl, now [Sunday morning] being on board the steamer crossing to the Island)—You and I know that the good Evangelicals are

really well disposed to such great Church truths when they know them, and I quite hope that much good will come out of this move.

On Tuesday after[n] I went down and dined at Fulham with the Bp. of London, and came up the next day with him to London to attend a meeting for supplying the labouring classes, &c. with water for washing and baths. It was a well-supported meeting. I went down after it to Lavington to meet Robert, who had stayed Tuesday at Alverstoke to give a lecture for me at the Gosport Literary Institution. On Thursday afternoon we went together to Surrey, I staying at Mr. Goulburn's. Friday, St. Luke's day, we had full Service and the Holy Communion at Reigate, and afterwards a meeting for the S. P. G.; the clergy and gentry attending in considerable numbers, and we had a very good collection. On Friday night I went down to E. Farleigh, and Robert, Henry, and I were together. We had a great deal of talk. I do not think that there is any danger of dear Henry actually Romanizing, but his love and inclination for it are frightful. He feels certain of Newman's going over, and, I see, expects it within the year. But he does not seem at all disposed to go with him.

On Saturday afternoon I went to Streatham to dine and sleep at the Parsonage and to preach two sermons to-day. Directly after dinner my letters were given me, and amongst others one containing an order to preach to-day at Osborne; set off forthwith for the station, as it was my duty to get down if possible. I found that I could get no special train, but I prevailed on them to affix a carriage for me to the luggage train, and I have been all night coming down, and am now coming over to Osborne. My future plans are,—on Monday, to-morrow, to return if possible to London, to an adjourned meeting at Mr. Kingscote's. On Tuesday I go down to T. Garnier's in Derbyshire, on my way to Yorkshire. On Thursday I preach for his Church fund, by an old Winchester promise. On Friday I am to go with Robert to Bishopthorpe; and on Saturday to attend an S. P. G. meeting there. On Monday to go with R. to the Bishop of Ripon's. Tuesday is the consecration of Markington Church,

at which the Bishop wishes me to preach. On Thursday I hope to return to London, and home Friday or Saturday, as I can. I am heartily tired of this running about, but I hardly saw how to avoid this trip. You will see by the enclosed note that the ArchB. of York has appointed me Sub-Almoner to the Queen. The offer came in a note addressed *Archdn. Wilberforce, Alverstoke*, whilst the ArchB. knew that *Robert* was with me; and I therefore felt a difficulty as to accepting it till I had quite secured its being really meant for me.

You will see that I have applied to Lord Howe about the church and failed; also to Lord Calthorpe, and found that he had given before. I have left a paper with the Bishop of London, who, I hope, means to do something in return for my supporting him in the soap-suds.[8] . . . I must stop and work a little more at my sermon. I am always your own brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

In after years Bishop Wilberforce was fond of telling the story of this Saturday night's journey, and of the inconvenience he experienced in writing his sermon for the morrow in a carriage attached to a train of trucks, which was continually stopping, and which had no buffers to break the shock of each stoppage. Far ahead at the other end of the train he could hear the *bump* of the first truck, and then of the next, and of the next, until, as it neared his own turn, the ink had to be secured from upsetting, and himself and his paraphernalia prepared for the constantly recurring jolt. It was during this singular night's journey that the first part of the foregoing letter was written, and, the circumstances being considered, the writing is wonderfully clear.

[8] Referring to the Bishop of London's scheme for baths and laundries.

CHAPTER VII.

(October 1844—October 1845.)

LAST DAYS AT ALVERSTOKE. DEANERY OF WESTMINSTER.

MR. W. G. WARD'S 'IDEAL OF A CHRISTIAN CHURCH' CONDEMNED — ARCHDEACON S. WILBERFORCE'S COURSE IN THE MATTER—THE PROPOSED 'NEW TEST'—CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. GLADSTONE RESPECTING IT —MESMERISM—LETTER TO REV. R. WALKER ON OXFORD MATTERS— APPOINTMENT TO DEANERY OF WESTMINSTER — LETTERS — MAYNOOTH GRANT, AND SIR R. PEEL—MEETING OF BRITISH ASSOCIATION AT CAMBRIDGE—LONDON LIFE—PROGRESS IN WORCESTERSHIRE—CORRESPONDENCE ON IRISH CHURCH WITH MR. GLADSTONE—ACCUSED OF AVARICE BY THE 'MORNING POST'—EXTRACTS FROM DIARY RESPECTING HIS INCUMBENCY OF ALVERSTOKE—OFFER OF BISHOPRIC OF OXFORD—EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS AND DIARIES CONCERNING IT—PRINCE ALBERT ON 'THE FUNCTIONS OF AN ENGLISH BISHOP'—ACCOUNT OF HIS WORK AS ARCHDEACON OF SURREY—LETTER OF ADVICE TO REV. H. W. WILBERFORCE ON TAKING POSSESSION OF HIS LIVING AT EAST FARLEIGH—LETTERS TO A LADY DESIROUS OF FOUNDING A SISTERHOOD AT ALVERSTOKE—LETTER TO EARL OF CHICHESTER ON MR. DRUMMOND'S SCHISM IN SCOTLAND.

SAMUEL WILBERFORCE'S days as Rector of Alverstoke, as Archdeacon of Surrey, and as Canon of Winchester were now fast running out; and though it wanted yet but twelve months before he was to be raised to the See of Oxford, still this final year was sufficiently crowded with incidents to require a separate chapter. Externally, the Church had been at comparative peace since Sir R. Peel's accession to power, in 1841, and the assaults upon it which accompanied and followed the Reform Bill had diminished. Internally, the excitement respecting the Oxford movement had been growing in intensity, and the close of 1844 and the

early weeks of 1845 were marked by one of the keenest of those party conflicts in which it involved the University. Forgotten as such conflicts now are, they must necessarily be referred to here at some length, inasmuch as without some such detail, and an account of his attitude in respect of them, it is impossible to present a true picture of Samuel Wilberforce's relations to the movements and the men of his time, or to exhibit the precise position towards Church parties under which he commenced his episcopate.

In the latter part, then, of the year 1844, Mr. W. G. Ward, of Balliol College, published a bulky volume entitled 'The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered,' in which, among many similar passages, the following occurred :—

> I know no single movement in the Church, except Arianism in the fourth century, which seems to me so wholly destitute of all claims on our sympathy and regard as the English Reformation. . . .
>
> We find—oh, most joyful, most wonderful, most unexpected sight!—we find the whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen. . . .
>
> Three years have passed since I said plainly that in subscribing the Articles I renounce no one Roman doctrine.

The consequence of this was that in December 1844, the Hebdomadal Board agreed to submit to Convocation, in February 1845, first, a proposition condemning selected passages from Mr. Ward's book as inconsistent with his declarations on being admitted to the degrees of B.A. and M.A.; secondly, if this were carried, a proposition affirming that Mr. Ward was disentitled to the privileges of those degrees, and degrading him accordingly; and, thirdly, an alteration in the University Statutes, making the declaration of assent to the Articles required before taking degrees

still more stringent, with a view to rendering it impossible henceforward for persons holding Mr. Ward's opinions to take it. This last measure was a very strong one, and it bore plain indications of having been framed under the excitement of panic in that it certainly overshot its mark, and could scarcely be said to be intelligible. For it actually proposed that candidates for degrees should declare their subscription to the Articles to be, first, in that sense in which *they* ex animo believed them to have been first put forth, and, next, in that sense in which the *University* now proposed them for signature ; and this without the smallest specification of the means of ascertaining the identity of these senses, or of fixing the sense which the University imposed. Controversy ran high enough as to the prior questions of condemning the book and of degrading Mr. Ward ; but it ran far higher on the question of the expediency and rectitude of imposing what was regarded as not merely a new test, but also as one liable to the utmost uncertainty in its application. The proposal was assailed by such a hailstorm of pamphlets from men of very various shades of opinion, that early in January it was withdrawn ; and a proposition of a milder nature substituted for it ; but even this found no favour, and the result was that when February 13 came the Proctors, in the exercise of their statutable powers, vetoed its being put to Convocation at all. It fared otherwise with the two preceding propositions. Mr. Ward's book was condemned by a majority of 776 against 386, or rather more than two to one, while, somewhat contrary to expectation, the proposition to degrade Mr. Ward himself was also carried, though by the much narrower majority of 569 to 511. Among those who voted against both propositions were Mr. Gladstone, Archdeacons R.

I. Wilberforce, Manning and Thorpe, Dr. Pusey, Dr. Hook, Dr. Moberly, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, Mr. John Keble, and Mr. Gresley. Dr. Tait, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, voted for the condemnation of the book, but not for the degradation of the writer. Archdeacon S. Wilberforce voted for the degradation of the writer as well as for the condemnation of the book—a step which, as will be seen from the foregoing list of names, separated him from many with whom he was closely connected, and from several with whom, in the main, he was disposed to act. Two letters to his brother Robert, written at the end of 1844, will explain his views on the matter, while a long letter from Mr. Gladstone both sets forth the objections to the measure and demonstrates the interest which the subject excited :—

Archdn. S. Wilberforce to Archdn. R. I. Wilberforce.

Alverstoke, Decr. 27, 1844.

My dearest R.,—I have been thinking much about this Statute. I am clear at present (1) that some change is needful to satisfy the claims of honesty, and to make men feel that they can trust their teachers. (2) That the proposed addition is objectionable,—(1) because, being morally inflicted on the suspected, it has an inquisitorial *ex post facto* look ; (2) because it is in its nature vague and uncertain, armed with barbed hooks for men of tender consciences and easily to be slipped through by men of convenient morality. What I desire, therefore, is this, that *all* who, having passed the *status pupillaris* (which signature means rather readiness to be instructed than a settled faith), should (δι' ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην), as the condition of a degree or office, declare in what sense they sign the Articles. I would, therefore, as Romanizing is the present danger, call on them to avow *that*, thus : 'I, A. B., do declare that I subscribe these Articles in that which I believe to be their plain natural sense ; that I intend thereby to declare that I believe the formal teaching of the Church of

Rome, as defined at the Council of Trent, to be erroneous and contrary to the truth of God's word, as on other, so especially on these points, the Justification of Man, Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration as well of Images as of Reliques, Invocation of Saints, Transubstantiation, and the foreign jurisdiction and supremacy of the Bishop of Rome,' etc. Do you see any objection to this? Ever your most affect^e^ brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

And again, four days later, on December 31, 1844:—

My dearest Robert,—I have only time to say, in one word, that I never meant to express full agreement with you as to Statute 3. I dislike it greatly. I should have greatly preferred my own. *But* I feel that something is necessary to defend integrity of subscription; and, if nothing else can be devised, I am far from certain that I shall not support this. I am clear that, as at present advised, I cannot vote against it.

I think Pusey's letter most unfortunate.

I cannot think it a *new test.* It is simply a protest against a new mode of evading the *old* test. I have not time for more to-day, but I could not rest without letting you know how far I meant to say I agreed with you. I wish you would write to Henry and try if you could *quiet* him. He has just seen a furious attack (I believe) against Wynter in the 'Chr. Rem^r^,' and this is sure to stir him up to some great extravaganza. Ever, with kindest love to and wishes for all New Year's blessings to you, your most aff. brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

The intercourse between Archdeacon S. Wilberforce and Mr. Gladstone at this period is well illustrated by a group of letters which passed between them, at the close of 1844 and the beginning of 1845, bearing largely on the questions then pending in Oxford, and the general prospects of the Church. The only explanation which need be added is that the

opening sentences in the first two letters refer to a review in the 'Quarterly,' written by Mr. Gladstone, which its editor, Mr. Lockhart, had submitted to Archdeacon Wilberforce prior to its publication :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Mr. W. E. Gladstone.

Alverstoke Rectory, Dec. 25, 1844.

My dear Gladstone,—At Lockhart's desire and your's, conveyed through him, I undertook to do what, from a sense of unfitness, I undertook reluctantly. If you have time to tell me that I did not do it otherwise than you would have me do it, I shall be greatly obliged to you for the assurance.

If, at the same time, you could suggest to me the points you had noted in my 'American Church,' I shall be much obliged to you : since I hear to-day that of 2,000 printed, 1,500 are gone, and corrections for the second edition are immediately called for.

Is your mind so made up, that you like to speak it as to the propositions for Convocation on Feb. 13? As at present advised, but waiting Ward's defence, I am prepared to affirm the two first, and undecided as to the third. I greatly regret Pusey's letter, which removes the chance of its dispassionate consideration. Ever, my dear Gladstone, believe me to be your's most sincerely,

S. WILBERFORCE.

I hope you have received a copy of my last Charge from the publisher.

To this letter Mr. Gladstone replied at length, as follows :—

Mr. Gladstone to Archdeacon S. Wilberforce.

Hawarden, Sunday, Dec. 29, '44.

My dear Wilberforce,—I had been on the point of writing to you for several days before your note reached my hands, and that has brought my intentions to a head. But I must be much more brief in my answer than the subjects, or at least some of them, deserve.

1. I knew nothing of your criticisms on the article, except

from Lockhart's general account; he offered to send me them, but, chiefly on account of time, I did not ask it. So far as I can judge, you did your duty faithfully by him and kindly by me. I do not mean that I was a convinced assentient to all the changes that were made, but we all felt the absolute necessity of retrenchment; and though I should have let the pruning-knife fall on the argument respecting conscience, I think it was reasonable and right that Lockhart's opinion should be the rule, and *à fortiori* so when it was backed by those of his counsellors, and I would on no account have had my own way about it.

2. I intended to tell you that, when I quoted a passage from your book on the 'American Church,' as implying that persons of Romish opinions ought to leave the Church of England, no doubt had crossed my mind as to the correctness of my construction of the passage, or I should, of course, have referred to you upon it. When I wrote to you about the book before, I had not reached that passage.

3. I am very glad to hear of the large sale of the book. There was, indeed, but very little in it upon which I remarked, even to myself, in an opposing or qualifying sense. Without my own copy of it, which, however, I am likely soon to see again, I could not refer intelligibly, I fear, to the passages; but I think there was one in which you treat the Papal supremacy as approximating to a virtual deposition of the Redeemer from the headship of the Church: a position which seems to me only applicable in any degree to the most Ultramontane theory respecting it. Speaking generally, I should say, it is to me one of the least formidable among the many and great obstacles to reunion. I grant, however, and deeply lament, that the course of things in the Roman churches tends powerfully towards the rigour and exaggeration of that doctrine.

4. My mind is only in an early stage of the process of fermentation on the subject of the Hebdomadal movement at Oxford; and anything I can say is therefore subject to a plenary reserve and reconsideration. But I confess that I can travel but very little way indeed with the Heads; perhaps no further than this, that Ward's propositions are each and all of

them deserving of censure. But then arises a serious question. If Ward is to be censured for what he has said of the Reformation, what is to be done with regard to other more prominent and dignified members of the University? For instance, Archbishop Whately (of whose sentiments concerning the Trinity I will not speak, because I have not the case fresh in my recollection) has written a book which I remember to have read long ago, for the purpose of proving the sleep of the soul—a doctrine which I imagine to be, according to the law of the Church of England, heretical. I do not go to any other instances, because one is enough; and though the point is, at first sight, a small one, yet it may be enough for my purpose, which is to show the difficulty I feel with regard to voting censure upon matter short of heretical, while heretical matter is spared. Nor do I think the common answer—one fault does not excuse another—is relevant in such a case. The question is concerning the theological character of the University. Laxity of discipline, though deplorable, is intelligible, and is distinguishable from a state of indifference; but if the reins are to be drawn tight, what shall we say if the relative proportions of heresy and inferior error are to be inverted? The University is bound to defend its lawful tests, but yet more to defend the Faith.

I have a further difficulty in declaring Ward guilty of a breach of faith. I think his interpretation of the last clause of Art. xix. utterly untenable; but certainly not more so than Simeon and Scott's interpretation of Articles, Catechism, and Prayer-Book alike with respect to baptism. All alike seem to me false, but I am not prepared to say any of them amounted to breach of faith; and more especially do I hesitate to punish the one as breach of faith, while I know it is quite beyond my power to punish the numerous living followers and representatives of the other—quite out of my power, and also not within my will.

With respect to the new test, I have not heard the argument for it, and have some difficulty in conceiving what it can be. In the first place, I apprehend much is to be said on the naked question of *legality*: but that I pass by. On general grounds, I see very many objections.

1. The recurrence to the sense of first promulgation is no guarantee against Wardism, because it is a part of Ward's theory that he is acting wholly within the theory of the promulgators.

2. The sense of first promulgation is a matter only to be known by much historical study; and, so far as I can get at it, I am disposed to believe it was a sense very liberal towards the Church of Rome. This appears to me to stand upon the face of the Articles much more than any other sense. But whether that be so or not, I do not think you should call on men to affirm virtually propositions of history, unless where they are known either by study or notoriety. And in this case few could have adequately studied, and I am not aware that any sense (*quoad* these points) is *notorious*.

3. I find, however, much greater difficulty still in conjecturing what is meant by the present sense of the University. I think there is no University sense sufficiently definite to be made the subject of a test. But even if that position be waived, where is this definite sense to be found? And is it fixed, or does it vary from year to year? If it means the prevailing impression on the minds of the majority of Convocation, then it is obvious to remark:—(1) Twenty years ago that was the sense of Bp. Tomline; but now it is clearly some other sense than that; and probably twenty years hence, it will again be a different one. I do not now speak of the sense with regard to matters of Faith—though even on that, alas, much might be said—but of the sense *quoad* protests against Rome, with regard to which I can hardly conceive it possible that there should not be a constant ebb and flow in the Ch. of E. within certain limits. (2) If it is difficult to know either where this sense is to be found, or *what* it is, it seems to me not short of a gross absurdity to expect men to declare that it is *the same as* that of the first promulgators of the Articles. (3) Further, the case is indeed frightful, if, as I understand, it lies wholly in the breast of the Vice-Chancellor for the time being to bring this engine into play. For in that case, practically, the sense is *his sense;* and on conformity to his sense must depend practically the access to degrees, and, in a great measure, to Holy Orders. I do not

scruple to say that this project, if I understand it aright, wears in this light an aspect of audacious and abominable tyranny. (4) Which brings us to a very serious matter. Assuming what has preceded to be true, I do think that the proposition itself is a violent blow to the whole doctrine and practice of subscription ; and that, if it be tenaciously adhered to, it will break down subscription altogether—in my view a very deplorable catastrophe.

All my invective, I admit, vanishes if it can be shown that there are good grounds to be alleged on behalf of the test, and loses much of its force if even a rational meaning can be assigned to it ; but if it be the clumsy, incomprehensible and illusory device that I conceive it to be, the attempt in this age to bind it on the consciences of men will recoil violently, and by the aid of the common foe will destroy the whole system of subscriptions.

Now I only beg that you will accept this free statement in subjection strictly to the representation I made, and which I now repeat. My mind is full of painful and alarming impressions, but they are quite immature.

5. And, by way of refreshment, I turn to your Charge, which I read on Sunday last, with very great pleasure. I should put in pleas for some things and some men which you might not admit ; but I cannot allow that recollection to break the force of my sympathy with your general tone and view with regard to the Church, nor shall it cool my admiration of the manner in which you have brought out your sentiments. Your's is the very opposite of the cold, effete, and repressive temper in which at Oxford and elsewhere Oxford excesses are commonly opposed ; and you do not allow that opposition, though you are very warm in it, to draw off the energy which should be spent upon the work of real development and improvement in the Church ; so that I find your usual strain to be full of encouragement and consolation.

You have enumerated in one very interesting part the modes of restoration which different parties suggest ; and you say it is not this or that particular amendment that will do ; —we want to be and to be felt to be the Church of this nation. Suppose, however, you were forced to say what was

the most formidable barrier in the way of the religion of the Church among the people? I confess I have a strong impression, though founded on very narrow experience, that your greatest difficulty is this: the Church preaches one thing and practises another. In the pulpit she preaches on the assumption of the distinctions between right and wrong, sanctity and sin; but in the administration of ordinances, where she acts, we find only the faintest vestiges of this distinction. Clerical life and doctrine have risen with a wonderful rapidity; the people improve, but in nothing like the same ratio. Upon the whole, the soil scarcely seems to answer in a just proportion to the culture. I am afraid that at least *a* secret of weakness lies in the fact that the system is a paper system and a mouth system: it has lost its judicial force; men are told to do right, and how to obtain strength to do right, and if they do right it is all well for them; but those who do wrong are practically treated in a manner so nearly identical that the reality of the distinction is scarcely traced, and vice loses a great part of the ordained means of correction, and Faith of support. Methodism and Dissent have a discipline;[1] and from it I believe they draw nearly all that is respectable and spiritually solid in their strength. To me, therefore, it always appears that, of the conditions necessary for the palpable manifestation of the Church as the Church, some are fulfilled, and some forward in the way to fulfilment; one faith and liturgy the first, the lives and the preaching of the clergy the second; but that the acting of the Church lags far behind; nor has the time come, nor can it, until after many more years of toil, when the mind of her members shall be instructed enough to let her act upon them. What proofs of this are we witnessing, and what errors of premature enforcement! Still as a voluntary work, discipline, I trust, grows and will grow, and the materials will gradually accumulate for its more general restoration.

I do not state all this, or any of it, in opposition to you, but merely by way of following a line which you have opened.

[1] The Archdeacon's Charge for 1844, on which Mr. Gladstone is remarking, had dwelt at some length on the discipline of the laity. See below, page 285.

I rejoice to see that your views are on the whole hopeful. For my part I heartily go along with you. The fabric consolidates itself more and more, even while the earthquake rocks it; for, with a thousand drawbacks and deductions, love grows larger, zeal warmer, truth firmer among us. It makes the mind sad to speculate upon the question how much better all might have been; but our mourning should be turned into joy and thankfulness when we think also how much worse it *was*. It seems to be written for our learning and use: 'He will be very gracious unto thee at the voice of thy cry; when He shall hear it He will answer thee. And though the Lord give you the bread of adversity and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed into a corner any more; but thine eyes shall see thy teachers. And thine ears shall hear a word behind thee saying, This is the way, walk ye in it.'

But I have been very long, though I have said little, and, of that little, some perhaps wrongly, and I can assure you at the least reluctantly; I mean where I have characterized in such violent language the proceedings of our governors at Oxford. I am too late for Christmas, but wish you a most happy new year; and I remain always, my dear Wilberforce, most sincerely your's,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Mr. Gladstone.

Alverstoke Rectory, Jan. 7, '45.

My dear Gladstone,—Many thanks for your note;[2] though honestly I cannot accept your conclusions for many reasons: (1) Hampden was punished according to what was *then* judged possible in the then state of the University; but we must surely not graduate all after punishments by one or two such past acts. (2) The amount of punishment *must* I think be regulated in part by other rules, and the mere sacredness of the matter with which the crime is concerned: facility of commission, completeness of proof, danger of imitation, consciousness of the offender;—all these and many more must, I think, come into account.

[2] The note referred to is not forthcoming.

Now he who is wicked enough to shake *all* faith in testimony, and I really think all in revelation, except subjectively in each man, though he begins lower down, may teach a much more dangerous doctrine than he who, having puzzled himself in metaphysical speculations, vents unconsciously things unworthy as to objects incalculably higher.

But I do not wish to plague you with an argument.

Since I wrote to you last and told you in confidence the then decision, I have heard again (also in confidence) what much qualified that information. It is that (1) the Board of Heads will not withdraw the new Statute solely because they will be beat upon it in Convocation; (2) that they *will*, on address signed by men of known moderation; (3) that they certainly are not averse to such an address; (4) that I am esteemed a fit person to prepare it. I have drawn up this and sent it to some friends. Any names for it may be sent to the Rev. R. Walker, Wadham Coll., Oxf^{d}; if before 1 on Monday they will be greatly the most efficacious. Ever, my dear Gladstone, believe me to be most sincerely your's,

S. WILBERFORCE.

And again, a few days later:—

Alverstoke Rectory, Jan. 14, 1845.

My dear Gladstone,—I am very much obliged to you for the very interesting and valuable letter which you so kindly found time to write me.

I cannot, I own, enter into your doubts as to the proceedings against Ward. No other man stands in his position. He avows a 'non-natural' sense as that in which he signs our Articles; declares his affection distinctly to the dogmatic teaching and practice of Rome in all points where Rome and England differ; and then challenges the University and the Church to punish him for so doing and holding. I think that, if his punishment be not certain and condign, it is better to give up all subscription to Articles.

Upon No. 3 I can go much further with you. I think it a bungling attempt indeed. If any addition to the existing 'criterion' were needed, it should in my judgment un-

doubtedly have been no more than a carefully guarded declaration touching the pressing form of error.

I have endeavoured, by a continued correspondence he has allowed me, to press this upon the Vice-Chancellor; and I have only to-night learned, with the greatest satisfaction, what you may possibly not yet know certainly (as it is still kept secret), that the new Statute (No. 3) will not be proposed to Convocation on the 13th. Ever, my dear Gladstone, believe me to be your's most sincerely,

S. WILBERFORCE.

Mr. Gladstone's reply was immediate :—

Mr. Gladstone to Archdeacon S. Wilberforce.

Whitehall, Jan. 16, '45.

My dear Wilberforce,—For the sake of the University, I am glad to hear that the test is withdrawn.

I feel more and more the difficulty of the delivery by Convocation of a sentence in the court of conscience upon Ward. At the same time I grant to you, that I should be very sorry to think for myself, that I subscribed the Articles in a non-natural sense. On the other hand, there are important phrases here and there, of which I am very far from thinking that I know the meaning with certainty, for example, in Art. xiii. It was a very improper and bad thing to say that he subscribed a certain clause in a non-natural sense; but I doubt if it amounts to bad faith: and yet more do I feel the false position in which the University and the Church will be placed, if in their judicial proceedings it be found that men may tamper with the Articles in relation to the Holy Trinity and the Offices of Our Lord, and retain their degrees, while a man who sins upon the particular points at issue between Rome and the Church of England is to be deprived of his, at the instance of a Board of which that very man (*sic*) is an active member.

I do not know how to escape the conclusion that the body so acting places matters less than of faith in a category of higher obligation than matters of faith.

The vehemence with which I have presumed to censure Ward leads me to feel a special duty of caution and rigid justice in these proceedings. Ever most sincerely your's,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

But the Archdeacon was too fully convinced of the necessity of some pronouncement against the views represented by Mr. Ward to be moved by these or any other arguments, however cogent; and accordingly, as already stated, he voted against Mr. Ward on both propositions. The fact is, that he was thoroughly convinced that secessions to Rome were imminent. To Mr. Charles Anderson he had written on October 22, 1844:—

Henry expects that Newman will go over to Rome, and even within the year,[3] so that here is to be the end of the movement which more effectually than any other was to guard men against Rome. The truth is, they have altogether changed their views. You and I agree with the beginning of the move for English Church principles, but you have no more intention than I have to pray to the Virgin instead of GOD, so why should we try to think we agree with them now we do not? *We* are Churchmen; *they* are Romanists; and I do think it very dishonest not to say so. If Newman is to go, the sooner he goes the better, because in going he will lose his power of leading others over with him.

The year 1845, the commencement of which the course of this biography has now reached, was destined to be a momentous one in the career of Samuel Wilberforce. In March he was offered, and after some short deliberation accepted the Deanery of Westminster, vacated by the promotion of Dr. Turton, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge,

[3] Mr. Newman actually announced his intention of so doing on October 8, 1845. See *post*, page 298.

to the Bishopric of Ely. In October followed his appointment to the Bishopric of Oxford, vacated by the translation of Bishop Bagot to the see of Bath and Wells. In each case the offer was made to him through Sir Robert Peel, at that time Prime Minister, and whom, as the diary records, the Archdeacon had frequent opportunities of meeting on the occasions of his attendance at Court. So far as the earlier days of the opening year are concerned, a quotation or two from the diary, two letters to Miss Louisa Noel, and one to his friend the Rev. R. Walker, will sufficiently indicate the course of his life and the subjects which occupied his thoughts. His attendances at the Pavilion and at Windsor were frequent, and one occasion is thus recorded :—

Saturday, Feb. 8.—Most kindly received at the Pavilion. Much conversation in the evening (the Queen, P. Albert, self, Miss Murray, Miss Kerr, Lord Ormond, Lady Queensboro'), so that cards stopped. Wrote first part of sermon on Temptation.

Sunday, 9.—Finished sermon. 'God did tempt Abraham.' Preached it. Interview with Prince. Queen came in. Much talk—Peel's Church measures—Gladstone. Sermons, why so dull? 'No object.' Sir R. Peel and Whitehall Chapel. After dinner long talk. Chess evening, which I regret, not that my own conscience offended at it one jot, but that capable of misconstruction, and not unlikely to receive it from Lady ——.

Sunday, Feb. 16.—The Pavilion. Got ready sermon. Preached morning. 'Motives,' 1 Cor. i. v. 5. Good deal of talk with Anson. Peel came down last night full of conversation.

It was at this time that the phenomena of Mesmerism were attracting much attention, and it is eminently characteristic of Samuel Wilberforce, always keen to investigate anything new, that he writes to Miss Noel

of his purpose of really trying to master it. Not less interesting is the second of the following extracts, in which his peculiar readiness to look at both sides of a question comes out in his language respecting Mr. W. G. Ward, notwithstanding his utter and outspoken condemnation of the tone of his book :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Lavington, Jan. 8, 1845.

I was delighted with what you said of my 'Charge' and 'American Church.' I believe this is selling well. There is a nice allusion to it, and general character, in the last 'Quarterly,' and I have had several very pleasant private notices of it. Lord Ashburton, who, from his strong understanding and great knowledge of the subject, is well qualified to give one, has spoken very strongly about it, both to me and to Justin. I do not expect it to be well received in America, because of the plainness of its speech.

I am very deep in Mesmerism, and can find no solid footground. I am endeavouring, by reading, really to master it. My present inclination is to think of it as quite allowable, but some points still perplex me: too long to write out. Meanwhile, it has been suddenly brought very curiously before me at another point. A parishioner, wealthy, eccentric, and a deep student, who has never let me see him, being unable from nervous affection to come to Church, and always retiring when I called, wrote last week to ask for an interview. (I will send the note if I can, a very strange one.) I gave an hour to him on Saturday, when it appeared :—(1) that he had read my sermons; (2) thought nothing so intellectual and beautiful had ever before appeared in theology (N.B.—he had never read any theology), and (3) wished, therefore, to open his mind to me; (4) had been all his life a deep and dissatisfied searcher after knowledge, going through pursuit after pursuit, and then casting unfilled each husk away; that two years ago he had his attention called to Mesmerism, followed it up through all history, magic, &c., to alchemy; magnetized his daughter, found her the most first-rate clairvoyante; with

the aid of her development advanced till he found that all real alchemy was magnetism, all its furnaces, crucibles, &c., a blind for the world, that the philosopher's stone was the power of creating, by being placed *en rapport* with creative power, that *he* knew how to attain it, and could make gold, &c. &c. All this was faintly sketched out to be filled in hereafter; but it is clear that he is (1) a very clever man, (2) nearly mad, (3) on the verge of developing for himself the Gnostic heresies, and (4) needing, therefore, great sympathy and great gentleness of pastoral treatment. I am to see him again next week, have borrowed a set of his books, which I am devouring, to come, if possible, to what magnetism is.

And again a little later in the year:—

On Saturday last I went down with Rob[t] and Lord Morpeth to see Pyne at his mesmerizing. We found all Philip had described; and finding a larger number of patients than he could attend to, we three undertook others, and I sent two into a deep magnetic sleep, one instantly and one soon. Pyne says that *practice* increases the power. This may account for my succeeding better than at Winchester.

The Same to the Same.

(*Extract.*)

Alverstoke, Jan. 31, 1845.

. . . I have been reading Ward's book very diligently in order to give an honest and informed vote on the 13th. It is quite shocking in its tone about the Reformers, Justification by Faith (a doctrine which he actually declares to be worse than atheism itself). But withal, there is a great deal in it very instructive and striking to me. He is a man of a most masculine understanding and a great love of truth and holiness. What a mystery is any heart, and how dark a mystery such a heart, such striving of light and darkness in the same heart. I have not a doubt myself as to the duty of punishing him. I am greatly alarmed by Gladstone's resignation, coupled with its announcement in 'The ,Times.' I fear that it foretells measures on Peel's part distinctly opposed to Church truth. I fear an ecclesiastical commission for reforming the

Liturgy without any reference to the Synod of the English Church. A few days will show. Trench is just leaving us; all furniture packed. It is sore work. It quite beat me down last night in Church to think it was his last official co-operation here.

And the next letter, to Mr. Walker, shows how vivid was the Archdeacon's interest in all that concerned the University of Oxford. Its date shows that it was written within a fortnight after the day when Mr. Ward had been degraded :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Rev. R. Walker.

Alverstoke, Feb. 27, 1845.

My dear Walker,—I am very anxious to hear what is being meditated about No. 90. I am deeply convinced of the inexpediency of moving in it again. I wish that you would use your facility of access to urge a few arguments for quiescence upon the Vice-Chancellor.

I would advance some such as these :—1st. The carrying of the measure is very doubtful. Do not readily disbelieve this. I have many opportunities of hearing the judgments of men of different schools on the subject, and I can assure you that a decided opposition to the proposal is far more common than you may imagine. I have reason to *know* that one highest in office in matters of State policy has recently expressed (I say this in confidence) strong opinions on this head, and men of another stamp are quite unready to support such an attempt. Take, for instance, Sir T. Acland, who gave 2 *placets* the other day, who has all his life been associated, on principle and in habits of life, with the party called 'Evangelical;' but he told me that, disliking himself the tenets of No. 90, he was disposed to say that it was not *certainly* a line beyond the large liberty allowed by the Ch. of E., and that he, therefore, should vote against its censure. Add to this all who will oppose because it has been once condemned, because it has been left so long uncondemned, because Sabellian and other heretical doctrines are left uncondemned, because Newman has virtually retired, because this would be opening the

flood-gates of a new strife; and I am confident that the success of the attempt is very doubtful. But even if it were carried by a small majority in the face of a large minority, what would be gained? The Board, supported by the men of one strong party, with whom certainly they do not sympathize wholly, would seem to have gained a hardly won triumph over a 4 years old pamphlet, gone by,—for Ward's views have wholly superseded it,—and they would have arrayed seemingly on the side of heterodoxy a vast proportion of most ortho. and well-affected men. I have 50 other strong arguments why the Board should give us a little rest; but will not bore you with them unless you tell me that these have not convinced you and that the danger is really imminent. . . . Pray give my kindest remembrances to Mrs. Walker, and believe me to be ever, my dear Walker, your's most sincerely,

S. WILBERFORCE.

On March 28 the offer of the Deanery of Westminster reached him, which he thus records in his diary:—

March 28, 1845.—Whilst at dinner with Trench, &c., a messenger came from Sir R. Peel with offer of Deanery of Westminster. Much perplexed by it. Greatly disposed to refuse it. Resolved to consult Anson. Off at midnight. Got to Windsor by ½ past 7. Found it was the Queen's wish. Peel had sent in two names, mine and B.'s. The Queen chose mine. Resolved; and off with A. to Farnborough and on to Farnham. Bishop at Godalming. Thither after him. Affecting conversation, and away to rail. Down to Winton. Wrote and accepted. Lord Calthorpe with me.

To Mr. Trench he wrote the next day:—

The Close, March 29, 1845.

Dearest Trench,—My own mind is *quite* made up that it is my duty to take this post. I have seen my Bishop, and it is strongly his opinion. I did him injustice in supposing he might be biassed. He was much and visibly affected at our parting

from our official connection, and said, when I expressed my pleasure at not taking from him the patronage of the Archy and Canonry, 'I can assure you that I cannot think of it with the smallest pleasure.' He thinks it *The* important Deanery. He is very strong on my *duty* of retaining Alverstoke, and I had come to the same conclusion. I may 4 full months and many several Sundays and Mondays be there. Now all his prejudices are against pluralities, and all his feelings would be to securing the patronage, so that I have a great confidence in his judgment herein, and am *quite* clear in my own judgment. If Monday morning is fine I hope to ride over to you. I fear to-night I cannot write to Maurice, but I long to do it, and will, please God, to-morrow.

I have written to Peel to-night to accept.

Ever, dearest Trench, your very affectionate friend,

S. WILBERFORCE.

And to Miss L. Noel the next week :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Alverstoke, April 5, 1845.

My dearest Sister,—I have been daily meaning to write to you, daily hoping to hear from you. What do you feel about this Deanery? I went up to London on Wednesday from Farnham Castle, and had a long talk with Dean Turton, and Sir R. Peel, and Sir Jas. Graham, and learned a great deal about the post, about its difficulties and its duties. I see so greatly its importance as quite to have often a sinking heart, but HE can make me able. I beg you to ask for me wisdom, discretion, and understanding. Its being close to the seat of Government, civil and ecclesiastical, makes it wholly unlike any other Deanery. Sir Jas. Graham, after enlarging on its openings, summed it up with this: 'It is one of the very finest positions in the Church of England.' The Bishop elect wishes to retain it until his consecration, and as that cannot be until May 3, I shall not take possession for a clear month, in which time I am going once more to 'visit' Surrey, and take leave of the clergy, and to take my Doctor's degree, &c.; so that at present I cannot find a day on which to allow myself the pleasure of a visit to Rom-

sey; but I quite hope for one. It is grievous to me beyond measure being so parted from Winchester and all its neighbours; but, on the other hand, the Stall there was almost the only thing I ever very much wished for or received with perfect satisfaction, and so never have I had a 'residence' which has not been marked with its own peculiar sorrows, and often overwhelming agonies. So little did we know! As to this post, it had never once crossed my mind till the messenger brought the offer, and then I shrank from it, so perhaps it is THE thing. My mind is now *quite* quiet about it. I see in it quite enough to occupy all my powers and time; and I do not look beyond it to any of the things we have talked about. . . .

I have been very poorly for 2 or 3 days, and so utterly depressed that I believe it has been influenza. To-day, thank God, I have been better, and have found voice to preach twice. Ever, dearest sister, believe me to be your own brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

The subject of the Maynooth Grant was at that time exciting a great commotion throughout the country, and the Archdeacon thus answered Mr. C. Anderson's inquiry as to his opinion on it:—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Mr. C. Anderson.

Alverstoke, April 26, 1845.

As to the state of affairs, I am quite for the Maynooth Grant; not as a thing that I like in itself, but as a necessary step in our position when Church and State are rather at the fag end of an old alliance than identifiable terms. No one, I think, can guess what matters are likely to come to. I confess I think it very difficult to answer Macaulay's speech about the Irish Church, whilst I feel not yet ready to go with him.

I think the cry against Peel most unjust. I think him perfectly honest; that he is a man who says and does what at the time he believes to be best for England; and whilst this exposes him to the charge of changing his ground, and is not the conduct of a very powerful generalizing statesman, it is, I think, just the thing which makes him a good governor for

us. We do not want deep Laputan principles of legislation, to change everything on an abstract idea, but just the practical modifications of existing systems which the change of all things makes unavoidable.

And to his brother Robert, more briefly, but not less emphatically, he wrote on April 29 :—

What think you of Maynooth? It seems to me quite unavoidable,—but another step towards the ultimate dissolution of all established religion.

On April 17 he took his degree of Doctor of Divinity at Oxford; on the 21st he delivered his sixth and last Archidiaconal Charge, as Archdeacon of Surrey, at St. Saviour's, Southwark, when, as he wrote to his brother Robert, his 'parting from his clergy and churchwardens was touchingly affectionate;' on May 9 he was installed as Dean of Westminster, on the 10th he went to Osborne, preaching there on the 11th, and in the course of the third week in May took up his abode in London.

June 1, 1845.—I have now been nearly 14 nights in London. I trust my purpose is clear. Oh God, give me grace to keep it. I have preached to-day 2^ce^ in W. Abbey with the deepest interest. I looked on it with dread; but the sight of the large congregation, the mass of heads, the number of *men*, the attention, moved me greatly. If ever in my life I felt a longing to speak Xt.'s truth, to be His instrument in saving men, it was, I think, to-day, and I earnestly asked the hire of souls. I have been less unable *rather* these few days to keep before me the true character and end of my life. Oh Lord, help me.

The very few months, during which Samuel Wilberforce remained Dean of Westminster, were too short a time for anything of moment to be initiated with regard to the Abbey or its services; and the only mention which occurs either in his diary or his corre-

spondence of any views or plans with regard to his duties or responsibilities as Dean is to be found in a single letter to Miss L. Noel :—

Dean Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Lavington, Aug. 7, 1845.

My dearest Sister,—It has gone greatly against my heart to be all this time without writing to you ; but I have been more busy than I almost ever was in my life, and now I am again in the blessed quietness of this holy place. It always seems to be another life which I have here. Being so separated from all my usual full occupation, it has, even without its associations, a sort of Paradise feeling, and when I was yesterday standing over that grave, with my dear Herbert clinging fondly to me, it seemed as if I was in another world.

You do not in the least misunderstand me ; you know how much I am really *interested* in my work; there is a great deal to do at Westminster, and it seems to me that I need a great deal of wisdom and simplicity to do it. The school is in a dreadful state, and very much, I feel sure, from the need of greater comforts, cleanliness, and attendance, which we ought to supply. If you treat boys as savages, they will be savages. Then the choristers are a grief of heart to me ; and the lay vicars also. Did I tell you that I was about to edit a very interesting little 'Memoir of a Maid of Honour in Charles II.'s Court,' and an eminent saint—an ancestor of the ArchB. of York, by whom the MS. is committed to me ? It seems to me to be very interesting and likely to be very useful. . . .

Almost the only other reference in his correspondence to his engagements at the period now under consideration is to be found in the following extract from a letter of June 30, 1845, to Mr. Trench, 'the dearest of my male friends,' as a contemporary entry in his diary expresses it :—

I am *very* much occupied at present, but I hope usefully. The congregation at the Abbey is very large and very attentive, and the openings for exertion all round me are most

numerous. I hope when the London season is over to have more time than I now have for reading, thought, and choice of time for seeing friends.

The powerful impression produced by his sermons is shown by the following extracts from the Earl of Carlisle's Diary :—

June 8, *London.*—Mary and I scuttled across the Park to hear the new Dean of Westminster preach at the Abbey ; we fell in with Milman and got good places. Very full. He preached with the greatest force, point, charm, beauty. What a fit place for his powers.

June 15.—I went to ask Lady Granville to come with me to Westminster Abbey, which she could not ; but the Levesons came with me instead ; she had never attended our service before. We went to the Deanery and Samuel took us in. He preached divinely, on the signs of receiving the Grace of God in vain, with so much power, beauty, and *practicalness.* Lady L. owned that she had never heard so fine a sermon, and wrote one sentence of it in her Prayer Book: 'Respectability is not conversion.' [4]

In fact, the only incidents of any note were his attendance and sermon at the meeting of the British Association at Cambridge in June, and a 'Progress' during July, as Dean of Westminster, accompanied by two of the Canons through parts of Worcestershire and Herefordshire, for the purpose of holding Courts on the Chapter Manors. He was now also a member of the Ecclesiastical Commission, the meetings of which he diligently attended when in London.

It is to be remembered also that he still retained Alverstoke, though ceasing to be Archdeacon of Surrey ; and after the first days of August the greater part of the interval now spoken of was spent there. Two letters to Miss Louisa Noel, the one describing the

[4] The Earl of Carlisle's Journals, pages 22, 23.

Queen's Drawing-room which he had just been attending, the other giving an account of the West-country progress, are perhaps two of the best specimens of his lighter descriptive style, crossed continually, as was his wont, with graver thoughts, that have yet been available for this biography :—

Dean Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

London, May 27, 1845.

Dearest Sister,—Many many thanks for your very welcome letter. I have been going on with this very busy London life, attending the Ecc[1] Commission, furnishing, writing sermons, being at the Abbey, &c. &c., and very full of occupation, and a great deal of it very interesting occupation.

I have been to-day at the Drawing-room—such a curious sight, as it always is to me. But oh! so much of the 'world's breath,' such a wonderful variety of faces: the thin upper lip, the restless, eager, craving eye, the heavy lower face, and the sleepy or large sensual eye; and here and there as to-day in Miss——, Bunsen's friend, and Lady M. W. and a few more, the calm, bright, intelligent, or retiring eye of a purity the world cannot blench, and a brightness it cannot fade. Then there was Lady ——, the type of a class, deeply worldly, beginning to age, fighting against it to desperation, and playing off two daughters of very great beauty, dressed admirably in a sort of exquisite green, with light flowers; and their hair like a mist floating round them, and only girdled by a wreath of lovely flowers, but seeming decked out like victims, played daily, hourly, minutely in this their sweet girlish youth, by a very clever, reaching mother, for coronets and a settlement. . . .

Dean Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Stinchcombe, July 16, 1845.

My dearest Sister,—. . . Coming back to my old friend, and for some reason specially to Prevost, is full of sadness to me as well as pleasure, and your kind voice always soothes

me unspeakably at such times. . . . Lord Teignmouth met me on Sunday afternoon at St. James', and we walked back over the hills to Malvern, a most beautiful even^{g}, and then I dined and slept at his house. The next morn^{g} I set off with my two companions for our Manor of Longdon, near Tewkesbury. My two companions were Canon Jennings, who is clergyman of the great parish of St. John's, Westminster, and had the Stall added as an endowment to that poor and populous parish. He is a good man, active, diligent, and real, very attentive to business, and very friendly and useful. He is about 50 years old. He receives all our money, pays and keeps all our accounts, and is altogether a very pleasant companion. The other is the Rev^{d} Temple Frere, brother of Hatley Frere the prophet, and the Spanish Ambassador Frere, a man of 65, florid, aquiline nose, full of all kind thoughts of every one, very fond of his family, thoroughly gentlemanlike in all his feelings, with a great deal of perception of beauty and a little mem. book into which all rare fonts, &c., are transferred in a neat pen and ink outline, a sense of humour and imperturbable temper, and I should think a great deal of devotion for his school and a very high sense of duty. You will see I have been quite well off in my companions, and in every way they have been all kindness to their Dean. I proposed the first evening that we should have family prayers daily—a new thing on our progress—and they most readily fell in with my wishes, so when we were at a small inn I read them to all the household as well as our *cortége;* and when otherwise to our *cortége* alone.

And now fancy us *en route*—a heavy landau, open or closed as the day invites, four grey or other post horses; on the box 'Mr. Miller,' a thin, sharp-faced solicitor's clerk, filling actually that office to Mr. George Vincent (or, 'Mr. George,' as he is commonly termed, to distinguish him from Mr. Vincent, the father, a son of the late Dean Vincent, and our Chapter clerk); in the box behind (1) 'the Dean's servant,' *i.e.* Mr. Radcliffe, my special apparitor, but now withdrawn for a while from Westminster and its smoke to rusticate in the country, and (2) Aldrich, 'the Canon's servant,' another apparitor, also servant to Mr. Gell our Receiver, and, in virtue of

servitude, sitting behind a face which, for rubicund brightness, might vie with Bardolph's (Mr. Gell being proprietor of 'Gell's Dalby's True Carminative Elixir. This only genuine :—T. Gell ; which to imitate is forgery,' and Aldrich being the compounder of its warming ingredients). Inside, the Dean, Canon Jennings (as senior) by his side ; opposite to the Dean Mr. Canon Frere ; opposite to Mr. Jennings 'Mr. George ;' and so we travel and hold our Courts, asking the clergy, &c. connected with us to dine, &c. The pocket of the carriage next the Dean contains Phillips' 'Geology of England,' a Geology Map, besides other small *agrémens.* Newspapers, &c. &c., abound.

On Monday, after a very pleasant day of business, from finding a proprietor anxious to improve one of our parishes, we went to Tewkesbury, examined thoroughly its beautiful church, and came over to Cheltenham ; went on Tuesday to Court at Deerhurst, and then came on here by ¼ to 6 ; was most affectionately welcomed and am now, Wednesday morn^g^, just setting off with Prevost to ride to Slymbridge Church, and thence to the railroad. This is a beautiful place. . . . Ever your own brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

Read in the light of subsequent events, now matter of history, the following interchange of letters between Mr. Gladstone and Samuel Wilberforce, so early as the year 1845, on the subject of the Established Church in Ireland, cannot but be interesting, in spite of the brevity with which the subject is touched. It appears that early in August Mr. Gladstone had sent to Dean Wilberforce a list of questions touching the status of the Irish Church for his consideration and reply, and bearing largely on the question whether the Anglican or the Roman Episcopate were the genuine representatives of the ancient Church of Ireland. These queries the Archdeacon acknowledges thus :—

Dean Wilberforce to Mr. Gladstone.

Alverstoke, Aug. 15, 1845.

My dear Gladstone,—I fear I shall have little chance of being able to sift your questions to the bottom, or I should gladly undertake to do so. Although you, I dare say, will, at least to a certain extent, agree with me in thinking that, important as such questions are at the time, the passing of years and an unquestioned title does greatly affect their importance, and that after all the one thing the Irish Church needs to do is to show that she IS the Irish Church. Failing this, I fear that no validity of title will long uphold her: nor, indeed, do I think it ought to do so. Let her show this, and I should not fear for her, even though all these alleged technical informalities were absolutely proved.

This letter was followed immediately by Mr. Gladstone's reply:—

Mr. Gladstone to Dean Wilberforce.

13, Carlton House Terrace, Aug. 16, 1845.

My dear Wilberforce,—Do not think that I intend to keep up the fire at this rate; but I wish, while I recollect it, to ask that, when it may suit you, you will kindly send back the queries which I sketched, as I omitted to keep a copy of them. I wish I could accept your comfort; for the quivering of historical positions on which important convictions have, in a material degree, rested themselves, is a process inciting disagreeable sensations.

I agree, indeed, that the political question of the continuance of the present settlement of Church property in Ireland will not be decided by a reference to my queries. As you say, title by descent will not uphold her, and efficiency would be her best argument.

But I am sorry to express my apprehension that the Irish Church is not in a large sense efficient: the working results of the last ten years have disappointed me. It may be answered —have faith in the ordinance of God; but then I must see the seal and signature, and these how can I separate from ecclesiastical descent?

The title, in short, is 'questioned,' and vehemently; not only by the Radicalism of the day, but by the Roman Bishops, who claim to hold the succession of St. Patrick, and this claim has been alive all along from the Reformation, so that lapse of years does nothing against it.

But I was far from wishing to put upon *you* the bolting of these questions to the bran, especially as I am much persuaded that one of our crying evils is to concentrate too many undertakings on single men instead of a just distribution.

The constitutional question of Succession, as the estate of religion, is a great though a secondary one; and it is more or less affected by these queries. Believe me most sincerely your's,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

The very last incident of all connected with his tenure of the Rectory of Alverstoke, and one which indeed only preceded by two or three days his nomination to the See of Oxford, was an attack upon him in the 'Morning Post' newspaper, charging him with 'avarice' for continuing to hold his living together with his Deanery. In one respect the circumstance may be deemed fortunate, for the result of it was that, while mentioning it in his diary, he sets down also a variety of particulars connected with his incumbency which it is interesting here to insert when about to record the close of his career as a parochial clergyman. The occurrence, together with the offer of the Bishopric of Oxford, which followed it immediately, is mentioned in the diary as under:—

Sunday, Oct. 12, 1845.—Preached at St. Mark's, mor[g]; Alverstoke, afternoon, eve[g]. Croker sent me 'Morning Post' with attack on me for holding Alve. with the Deanery for avarice. God, Thou knowest herein my innocence. Upon reckoning up, I think I have hardly *drawn* above 400*l.* per annum[5] for myself, the rest having gone in charities, repairs, churches, schools, &c.; and I have been able to ob-

[5] The annual value of the living is returned in the Clergy List of 1845 as 1,287*l.*

tain, or contribute, to permanent Church objects in the five years—

	£
Towards Anglesey Church	1,200
,, Alverstoke Schools . . .	900
,, Elson Church	2,400
,, Gosport School	1,180
,, ,, Church	4,300
	9,980

I am most thankful that God has suffered me to *see* the labour of my hands.

Monday, Oct. 13, 1845. Alverstoke.—Sent down to Croker draft of answer to 'Morning Post,' for Cruickshank, if he liked, to send. Croker *had* written yesterday to Peel about it, and advised at this moment *no answer*. I acquiesced in his judgment.

Tuesday, 14.—Afternoon at 6, while sitting with Mrs. Sargent, arrived messenger from Sir R. Peel, with offer of Bishoprick of Oxford.

I had wished for this, and now that it comes it seems *awful*. Wrote to Sir R., whose letter was remarkably cordial, and accepted. To Anson and the Prince.

Wednesday, 15.—Many letters on this business. Visited a little in parish.

Thursday, 16.—Letter from my Bishop. A very sensible and truly friendly one from Anson. Danger of eloquence, &c. Saw a few poor and sick.

His announcements of the appointment to Miss L. Noel and to Mr. Trench were, as usual in the case of these two intimate friends, both unreserved and immediate :—

Dean Wilberforce to Miss L. Noel.

Alverstoke, Oct. 14, 1845.

My dearest Sister,—You must hear this day from me, that a messenger has arrived from Sir Robert Peel, with a *very* cordial letter, in which he states that he has just heard from the Bishop of Oxford that he will accept Bath and Wells in lieu of his present preferment ; that, when at Windsor Castle,

he had suggested to Her Majesty that in case of that acceptance, I was the fittest person for the See of Oxford; that Her Majesty had most cordially acquiesced in the suggestion, 'with very kind expressions towards yourself on her part and on that of the Prince;' and that he, therefore, offered me the See of Oxford.

Ah! dearest sister, when you and I have talked of such matters, how different has it looked from what it does now! I thought I knew my unworthiness of such a post; but now I see that I never felt it at all. My soul is penetrated with a thrilling sense of it. Yet you will understand how, without real inconsistency, I yet feel I could not decline the offer so made. I have written to accept it. Pray for me, dearest sister, that neither may Christ's Church suffer damage, or I ruin my own soul in these new responsibilities being committed to me. One word will be very comforting to me. It should not go beyond you, and——and——for a few days, as Peel will not have my answer till to-morrow, or be able to communicate it to the Queen till the day following that. Ever, dearest sister, believe me to be your quite own brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

Dean Wilberforce to Rev. R. C. Trench.

Alverstoke, Oct. 15, 1845.

My dearest Trench,—I am very anxious that you should hear from me direct, that it has pleased God I should be called to the high and perilous office of a Bishop. I received yesterday a remarkably cordial letter from Sir. R. Peel, saying that he had just heard from the Bishop of Oxford, who assented to taking the See of Bath and Wells in lieu of his present preferment—farther, that when at Windsor Castle, he had submitted my name to the Queen as the fittest person to succeed to the See of Oxford, should it become thus vacant, and that Her Majesty had been pleased cordially to approve the selection.

I have written to accept it. . .

I cannot tell you how overpowered I now am with the thought of it. As I have sometimes viewed it in times past,

in the distance and uncertain, it has seemed that such a post would open to me such room for service, that I have desired, if it were God's will, greatly that I might be offered it; but now that it is come indeed, all its fearful responsibilities, its doubtful questions, its far-reaching issues, and my own blindness and infirmity, seem to stare me out of all conscience. I beseech you, true and dearest friend, that you pray for me as you have never prayed before, that I may not, in entering on this office, do any injury to Christ's Holy Church, or ruin my own soul; but that His Grace may rest upon me largely, and sanctify and save me, and make me strong and wise for Him.

Your ever aff. friend,

S. WILBERFORCE.

Private.—I have written to stir up Bunsen to try to seize, for Maurice, some of the dropped preferments.

A few days after his acceptance of the See he received the following letter from Prince Albert:—[6]

H.R.H. Prince Albert to the Dean of Westminster.

Windsor Castle, Oct. 19, 1845.

My dear Dean,—I had intended to commit to paper for you my views upon the position of a Bishop in the House of Lords, but gave up the idea, fearing that it might appear presumptuous on my part. Anson, however, tells me that he is sure you would not consider it as such, and would be pleased if I were still to do it; I accordingly resume the pen.

A Bishop ought to abstain *completely* from mixing himself up with the politics of the day, and beyond giving a general support to the *Queen's Government*, and occasionally voting for it, should take no part in the discussion of State affairs (for instance, Corn Laws, Game Laws, Trade or Financial questions, &c. &c.); but he should come forward whenever the interests of Humanity are at stake, and give boldly and manfully his advice to the House and Country (I mean questions like Negro Emancipation, education of the people, improvement of the health of towns, measures for the recrea-

[6] This letter has already appeared in Mr. Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort*, vol. ii. pages 132–134.

tion of the poor, against cruelty to animals, for regulating factory labour, &c. &c.).

As to religious affairs, he cannot but take an active part in them ; but let that always be the part of a *Christian*, not of a mere *Churchman*. Let him never forget the insufficiency of human knowledge and wisdom, and the impossibility for any man, or even Church, to say, 'I am right, and I alone am right.' Let him, therefore, be meek, and liberal, and tolerant to other confessions; but let him never forget that he is a representative of the Church of the Land, the maintenance of which is as important to the country as that of its Constitution or its Throne. Let him, here, always be conscious that the Church has duties to fulfil, that it does not exist for itself, but for the people, for the country, and that it ought to have no higher aim than to be the Church of the people. Let there be, therefore, no calling for new rights, privileges, grants, &c., but show the zeal and capacity of the Church to stretch her powers and capabilities to the utmost for the fulfilment of her sacred duties to the people, in ministering and teaching. A Bishop ought to be uniformly a peacemaker, and, when he can, it is his duty to lessen political and other animosities, and remind the Peers of their duties as Christians. He ought to be a guardian of public morality, not, like the Press, by tediously interfering with every man's private affairs, speaking for applause, or trampling on those that are fallen, but by watching over the morality of the State in acts which expediency or hope for profit may tempt it to commit, as well in home and colonial as in foreign affairs.

He should likewise boldly admonish the public even against its predominant feeling, if this be contrary to the purest standard of morality (reproving, for instance, the recklessness and the wickedness of the projectors of Railway schemes, who, having no funds themselves, acquire riches at the expense of others, their dupes). Here the nation is in the greatest danger, as every individual gets corrupted, and every sense of shame is lost.

In this way, the Bishops would become a powerful force in the Lords, and the country would feel that their presence there supplies a great want, and is a great protection to the people.

I have spoken as thoughts have struck me, and am sure you will be better able than I am to take a comprehensive view of the position. Ever your's truly,

ALBERT.

Here, then, closes such an account as it is possible to give, alike of the outward career and of the inward life of Samuel Wilberforce up to the time when, at an unusually early age, he was called to the Episcopate. But though comparatively young in years (he was only just forty) he could not be regarded as young in experience, or in knowledge of many kinds of men, or as untried in many kinds of work. Of the thoroughness with which he discharged his pastoral duties in a rural parish much has been already said; as well as of the way in which he drew the clergy of the Isle of Wight together.[7] At Alverstoke he had succeeded in the more difficult task of thoroughly reanimating a slumbering parish and of rousing such an amount of zealous co-operation as enabled him within five years to build three new churches and two new parochial schools. Concurrently with all this there was his frequent attendance at Court, continually bringing him into contact not merely with the highest personages in the land in the social sense, but also with the most active and influential members of the political world, and all this while yet at an age to profit to the utmost by opportunities of observation which rarely fall to the lot of a clergyman busily engaged as he was in the practical duties of his calling. With all this he remained keenly alive to every detail of the remarkable movement of which Oxford was the centre, carefully watching each several step and forming judgments of his own which, as has been unsparingly exhibited, were not always in accordance

[7] See *inter alia* the extract from Mr. R. H. Froude's letter on page 63.

with those of many who, whether through ties of kindred or of affection, were most regarded by him. Add to this that he was already a trained and striking speaker and a most winning preacher, and it will be admitted that few men had ever enjoyed a more thorough or more diversified preparation to take advantage of the variety of indirect opportunities of influence and usefulness, civil and social, which lie before the members of the English Episcopate, in addition to the directly religious and ecclesiastical duties which devolve upon them. Nor had inner discipline been wanting to give the needed balance to the exterior life now spoken of. Sir Henry Taylor, in one of the most sagacious of modern poems, introduces the hero's mentor as describing the dangers which result when all time for sorrow is crushed out by a life of business. To Philip's speech, 'We have not time to mourn,' Father John of Heda replies:—

> The worse for us;
> He that lacks time to mourn lacks time to mend,
> Eternity 'll mourn that.[8]

Samuel Wilberforce, if any man, might have been deemed one whose almost restless activity gave him no 'time to mourn.' It has, however, been shown that he could make the time which did not come ready to his hand, and that he at least recognised to the full the lessons of amendment and of discipline with which sorrow is charged. It is, of course, impossible for any one to judge how far the marvellous activity of the power of sympathy which distinguished him through life, and the absolute steadfastness with which he pursued whatever course appeared clearly right in spite of every temporal inducement to the contrary, may have *resulted* from the use to which he put the

[8] *Philip van Artevelde*, vol. i. page 42. Ed. 1834.

trial which was sent to him; but this at least is clear, that it would be a grave omission to take no account of it when summing up the influences which went to prepare him for the work of his life.

There is, however, one element in that preparation of which as yet little has been said, but of which it is necessary that before this chapter closes some mention should be made—the work of his Archidiaconate. It is a frequent observation that appointments to bishoprics labour under the disadvantage that, for the most part, the individuals appointed have had little opportunity of preliminary apprenticeship. The powers and qualities which render a man a skilful guide of individuals, a devoted parish priest, a valuable preacher, or a distinguished divine, are not those which necessarily guarantee success in the specific functions of the overseer of a diocese. And this holds good most especially under the very peculiar conditions of the Church of England, wherein have to be considered not merely the overgrown size of the dioceses, but the character and independence of the beneficed clergy, and, throughout the rural districts at least, the indispensable necessity of maintaining a good understanding with the territorial laity. Besides all this, even as regards his dealings with his clergy, a Bishop's actual power is singularly small. Within a certain limited range indeed the course of legislation has made or left him almost autocratic. But in many other particulars, and those not the least important, his influence is just so much as he can win by tact or sympathy, or by that most real but most indefinite quality which, for want of a better word, may be called persuasiveness.[9] Many and diversified as these condi-

[9] Not without reason did the Greeks deify the faculty of persuasiveness and rear temples in honour of the Goddess Πειθώ.

tions are—and every one of the smallest experience knows how easily the list might be extended—the misfortune is that prior to actual experience it is almost impossible to say how far any given individual is likely to succeed. Here, as in so many other ways, Samuel Wilberforce was an exceptional man. It was not only that he had great natural tact, a rare gift of leadership, and an instinctive tendency to become, in whatever position, as was seen even in his early days at Brighstone, the centre of influence among those around him, but that these innate faculties had in his case been stimulated by exercise and cultivated by practice. It was no small advantage to him that during the early years at Brighstone his position as Rural Dean, and his close personal intimacy with his Bishop, familiarised him from the first with the requirements of a Diocese as a whole and the method of its administration; and it is not difficult to trace the educating effect upon the future Bishop Wilberforce of the annual gatherings at Farnham under the presidency of Bishop Sumner, then in the prime of life and energy.[1] But Samuel Wilberforce's appointment to the Archdeaconry of Surrey, and the way in which he set himself to carry out the duties of the office, were perhaps the very best preliminary discipline which could have been devised for many of the duties of his episcopate, though by no means for all.

The words 'the way in which he set himself to carry out the duties of the office' are here used advisedly, for perhaps there is no office whatever of which

[1] It is matter of mere justice here to state that the mass of letters from Bishop Sumner of Winchester between the years 1830 and 1840, which were preserved by Bishop Wilberforce, and which have been read through for the purpose of this Biography, are striking evidence of both the watchfulness and energy with which the Diocese of Winchester was administered, and also of the acuteness and promptitude of Bishop Sumner himself.

the discharge depends more upon the conception which its holder chooses to form of its requirements than the Archidiaconate.[2] Samuel Wilberforce, as might be supposed, did not take the easiest or the most perfunctory view. It was not only that in his Annual Charges, generally read over to his Bishop before delivery, he took a wider range of subjects than had hitherto been usual,[3] but that, in spite of his pastoral duties at Alverstoke, the constant interruptions of his attendance at Court, and his annual 'residence' as Canon of Winchester, he yet made it his business to bring his personal influence to bear on every parish and every clergyman in the Archdeaconry.

The gradual revival of ecclesiastical organisation which marks our generation, which is even now but in the mid course of its development, and which will cause it to live in history to the full as much as its theological movements, was then manifesting the first stirrings of its life. In the Diocese of Salisbury the Ruridecanal Chapters had lately been revived. The same thing, too, was occurring in the Diocese of Chichester. Samuel Wilberforce was, above all things, an organiser and an administrator. Many-sided as was his character, and manifold as were his gifts, great as was his power of dealing with individuals, it may still be questioned whether the political instinct (using the word in its generic sense)—the instinct of organising

[2] Every one will remember the occasion when Bishop Blomfield, being suddenly appealed to in the House of Lords as to the nature of an Archdeacon's duties, warily replied that it was 'to be always going up and down the diocese discharging *Archidiaconal functions*.'

[3] He was not unconscious of this, and on Dec. 18, 1843, had written to Mr. W. E. Gladstone :—

'I am far from not perceiving the danger you indicate from non-episcopal doctrinal Charges. But it is most difficult to know what at the present time to do in the sort of pseudo-episcopate into which so many causes have changed the Archidiaconate. For so much is some expression of opinion looked for by the clergy, that its suppression would appear like a shifty evasion of difficulties.'

and influencing men in numbers—was not the strongest instinct in his nature. One day at Lavington House, on leaving the dining-room, Mr. R. Cobden said to the person who was standing next him, 'What think you of our host? I say, if he had not been a Priest he must have been a Prime Minister.' The late Lord Chelmsford, too, used to say, 'It was lucky for some of us that he was a Bishop and not a lawyer, for had he been one of us he must certainly have been Lord Chancellor.' And thus it was that Samuel Wilberforce, the moment that official position was given him, began to show his native capacity to the full extent that the case admitted of. The Archdeaconry of Surrey was co-extensive with the county, and, therefore, the mere visitation and inspection of its many churches was no small charge. But the new Archdeacon's plan went far beyond this. His effort was first to bring the clergy of each Rural Deanery together in at least quarterly meetings, if possible during the Ember weeks, and then himself to be present at as many of these meetings as possible, especially the first meetings in each Deanery, so as both to fix the method and tone of the procedure and also to make himself personally acquainted with the character and tendencies of each individual clergyman. Nor were the laity forgotten. These meetings were to commence with service, sermon, and Holy Communion in the parish church, to which he desired that the laity should be specially invited. Again and again, throughout the years 1841–1845 his diaries contain whole groups of entries such as these:—

Tuesday, Mar. 7. [1843]—Wrote greater part of Sermon. Full Service. Preached and administered Holy Communion: 14 clergy,—laymen. Then luncheon;,then discussion. The C——'s excellent people, simple, earnest, and good. On to Witley in Chandler's carriage at night.

Wednesday 8.—Morg, letters, &c. Then Service, as yesterday:—clergy,—laymen. Then discussion; more decided Church tone than yesterday; —— least so, but very good fellow. Yesterday —— of —— unpleasant tone, —— of —— Low Church, and very crude. —— of —— Low, but more air of personal goodness. At night to Guildford in Chandler's carriage. Train to Wimbledon, and to Tritton's, where James and Blackwell.

Thursday 9.—Morng, letters, &c. Then church, nicely done up. ——'s case, &c., and Tritton's: full congregation and attentive; 32 clergy, and 39 lay people communicated. 13*l.* for S.P.G. Afterwards discussion, as before, for 2 hours. Far more Church tone than expected. All save ——, ——, and ——, of ——, more or less sound. Pleased greatly with —— and —— as compared with what I expected. Afterwards on with Blackwell in fly to Kingston. Then rail to Winchfield, where stopped by earth slip.

And one of the many letters written to his Rural Deans, containing his wishes regarding these meetings, is as follows:—

Witley, Dec. 8, 1842.

My dear Friend,—Many thanks for your kind letter, to which I hasten to send a line in reply, hoping to reach you before you invite your clergy.

Monday, Jan. 2, I could not be with you, having already engagements on that day; but if you do not think the heart of the winter a bad time to draw your clergy out (which I should have feared it was), I would have come by the following Monday.

We held yesterday our meeting here; and I wish to lay before you at once the decision most unanimously come to. As the meeting is to be only *4terly*, it was judged possible and very desirable to give it a more *Church* and *Devotional* tone than a mere meeting for discussion could wear. It was therefore resolved, (1) that the meeting should be to Prayers, Sermon, Eucharist in church at 11, cold luncheon or hot at ½ past one:—½ past 2 to half-past 4 discussion. The Sermon to be preached, or the preacher appointed, by the clergyman at whose parish the gathering took place. This to be the Rural

Dean's, unless he thought it better to allow it to be invited elsewhere. The money to go to some common Church object. The laity, of course, to be welcomed to church and Eucharist, of which the common notice to be given Sunday preceding.

The discussion to be opened with Collects from *Liturgy*, read by host. R. Dean to be chairman and keep order. All remarks to be addressed to *him;* no *separate* conversations to be allowed; end with Collect, &c. The meetings to be held on Wednesday in Ember weeks. The first, next Ember-days in March—Ordination Service, subject of discussion. The Rural Dean of the next Deanery, Mr. Cole, was present, and heartily assented to all; to his Deanery I go to-day, where he will propose this scheme to the clergy, only naming the *Tuesday* in Ember weeks for their day.

Perhaps if you approve of this you will, either by letter or at a meeting, suggest the same plan. *I* should greatly like its uniformity, and if you named *Thursday* in Ember weeks I might hope to come on from this to you quarterly. I hope to return home to-morrow. I hope to meet you and others from Surrey at Winchester on Thursday. I wish I was in residence to play the host to you. Believe me to be your's most sincerely,

S. WILBERFORCE.

Samuel Wilberforce held the Archdeaconry from November 1839 to April 1845. During this period he delivered six Charges. Of the first a careful account has been already given. Of the rest it may suffice to say that they dealt with all the more important ecclesiastical affairs of the day, and that the perusal of them at this distance of time carries the reader, who is old enough to remember the period, back with singular vividness to its movements and its anxieties. Very urgent was the Archdeacon on the restoration of churches, and likewise as to the abuses of the system of pews, though with characteristic moderation he declined[4] to go all lengths with the Cambridge Camden

[4] Charges for 1842 and 1843.

Society, then beginning its crusade against them. The duties of Churchwardens[5] were an especial theme with him. The Factory Commission's Report and the state of education in the manufacturing districts, to which special attention was drawn in consequence of the disturbances of the period, were dealt with in 1843. The restoration of the Diaconate and the encouragement of lay-agency were insisted on at length in 1844. The restoration of something like discipline of the laity was touched on both in 1842 and 1844; showing how much his mind was given to the subject. In the Charge for 1842 he wrote:—

'There seems to be a rising persuasion that the Church cannot long maintain her ground unless some means are taken to give form and substance to the faint and still fading shadow of discipline which scarcely survives amongst us. That discipline, I need hardly remind you, must consist, not in any, the very smallest, civil infliction, but in her possessing and exercising the power of suspending or even excluding from her communion notorious and hardened offenders. To what extent our want of this power has injured us it is impossible to calculate. Never certainly before, since her foundation, has the Church been without this outward mark of her spiritual authority; and even now she stands alone among the sects, each one of which claims for itself, and claims successfully, this power of self-purification, which is almost withheld from her. . . . A Church without discipline is a new and fearful experiment.'

In both 1844 and 1845, he spoke at length upon the spiritual needs[6]—since then how greatly increased

[5] Charge for 1842.

[6] At that date he gave the following, amongst other statistics:—Lambeth, population 120,000, church accommodation for 20,000; Bermondsey, population above 35,000, church accommodation for 3,000; St. George the Martyr, population above 50,000, church accommodation for 2,500. The educational statistics are even worse. 'Church schools for 500 children to a population of 50,000 is the average provision we have yet reached.'

—of South London, while in the latter, his farewell Charge, he makes the remarkable statement that during the little more than five years of his tenure of the Archdeaconry he had personally visited almost every parish under his jurisdiction.

This already lengthened chapter would still remain an incomplete account of Samuel Wilberforce prior to his becoming a Bishop if it failed to include a few specimens of his mode of treating special cases, as shown in his correspondence, but which it would have broken the thread of the narrative to have introduced in their exact chronological positions. Of these the first shall be a letter to his brother Henry a few months after his appointment to the vicarage of East Farleigh under the circumstances which were detailed on page 222. The immediate occasion of the letter was some difficulty between his brother and the curate whom he found in the parish; but its tone and the character of its counsels are too characteristic not to demand its insertion :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Rev. H. W. Wilberforce.

(*Private and Confidential.*)

Alverstoke Rectory, Aug. 18, 1843.

My dearest Brother,—It is a scarcely needful preface to say that I am exceedingly sorry you have got this bother upon your hands with your curate. But it seems to me quite clear what you ought to do. If you break with Mr. —— you will effectually bar your usefulness in your parish, it may be for years, it may be for life. *He* will be a martyr for one side of the truth; *you* a persecutor. It is rather difficult for me to say all I feel to one differing on points of doctrine connected with this unhappy set of opinions, but I will try.

All those persons, then, in your parish who are earnest followers after y^e^ individualities of personal religion will more or less be disposed to suppose him a martyr for the Gospel, and

against you their breasts will be closed if you dispossess him. Therefore I say by all means keep him—and thus *I* should try to do it. *Write* to him a letter saying that you still expect to be joined by your old curate, but not at present; that you therefore wish him to continue to act with you, say for 3 months, if he will, with 6 weeks' notice, and that you now only make the arrangement for his going that you may not lose your power of placing your old curate again with you. But that if he, Mr. ——, will enter into this engagement with you so as to secure this, you should be glad to retain him, and that then, should you find that you both worked well together, you would gladly *offer him* the curacy in perpetuity, if your old curate did not come to you; and that at all events it will give him time to look about for a fit place. This will place *you* right, whether he accepts or declines. If he declines, you have not expelled him. If he accepts, he will, it is pretty plain, abstain from what offends you. Then, by his working with you, you get his testimony to your holding the essentials of the Faith, and so you step without breach into your saddle. *If it is true* that he has preached as violently as you hear, this will only be the more strikingly the case, if he now keeps to plain practical sermons, and acts with you. But my strong feeling is that you will not find that you can substantiate such violence. It is so likely that he has been misrepresented, so likely that preaching, it may be injudiciously, against what with him *I* think the perils of our Church from the insane love of Rome, which has possessed many of the followers of the 'Tract movement,' and then perhaps speaking against Puseyism, the two have been put together, that I feel you would substantiate nothing; and then further, suppose he had preached against Puseyism by *name*, you certainly would get nothing from appealing to the Archbishop. Dr. P., having a brother in the neighbourhood, cannot make it offensive opposition to preach against the written and published tenets of a *party* under that distinctive appellation. And with so large a body of the Church conscientiously convinced that the *tone* of the party aimed at, and very many of its leading docrines, will certainly, if they obtain the pre-eminence, destroy the purity of our Reformed

Communion, the Archbp., even if he were different in every particular from what he is, would *do* nothing but regret your difference, and think you both troublesome blockheads for disagreeing. I doubt if even Laud would have been short-sighted enough to do more.

For you must remember, dearest H., that your own feelings are here a bad guide. You must remember that even men who, like myself, are *not* Low Churchmen, that even we feel in the very centre of our hearts that the greatest verities of the inner Christian life are absolutely perilled by the Tract system. Even then, if Mr. —— has been rash and ill-judged and vulgar in his way of testifying against them, you cannot get him condemned for that testimony, whilst all the stream of *natural* feelings will set against the well-endowed vicar and with the poor curate. I do firmly believe that, if you can win this man to you by extreme kindness, by confidence as far as you *can* give it, by securing his fellowship in parish work, &c., with you, you will therein have an opportunity of making an *unprejudiced* entry on your duties, which, after all that is past, you could scarcely have obtained in any other way whatever. And I believe this to be beyond price. Believing, as I firmly do, my beloved brother, that,—in spite of the injury which Newman's teaching, and still more ——'s influence, has done to your ministerial efficiency,—you will set forth amongst your people the Gospel of our only Lord and Saviour,—the fruit of our two[7] fathers' prayers and teaching and tone is *in you*, and will even more than your speculative tenets colour your ministry, I do earnestly desire that you should enter at East Farleigh with as little previous prejudice against you as possible; and all seems to me to be herein at stake. Suppose you are away 2 or 3 Sundays and Mr. —— preached against Puseyism, what then? If he works heartily with you, either your doctrines are not Puseyite in his judgment, or the matter is not of vital moment, or he is insincere, and anyhow *your* standing in the parish is not affected. I beseech you bear anything, suffer anything, to conciliate this man and prevent this breach. I trust, too,

[7] Referring to Mr. Sargent, their father-in-law, and to Mr. Wilberforce, their father; the Bishop and Mr. Henry Wilberforce having married sisters.

from your account that you can *very* soon get into residence. This is surely now of great moment, and you *must*, if need be at great trouble, get there for Sunday duties. I could weep, beloved Henry, at our differences. But every day makes me feel more that there *is* a difference. You know my Friday's occupation, and that I have not time to say more than that I am ever your most loving brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

No record is known to exist of the result of this appeal. The following two letters were written to a lady desirous of founding a 'Sisterhood,' whose plans were submitted to Archdeacon Wilberforce by his friend Mr. C. E. Kennaway. It is illustrative of the estimation in which the Archdeacon was held, as regards zeal in all good works, that this proposal was laid before him at all, and it has a further interest when his subsequent connection with, and watchful care over the development of, the Clewer Sisterhood is borne in mind:—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to Mrs. A——.

(*Private.*)

Alverstoke Rectory, Jan. 28, 1844.

My dear Madam,—Since I wrote to Mr. Kennaway last Wednesday from Salisbury, I have had more leisure to think over the plan opened in your letter to him, and I wish to say a few words more to you concerning it. And, first, I wish to express even more strongly than I then did my grateful welcome for any such attempt to meet the urgent wants and evils of our present moral, social, and spiritual state. So far from discouraging such desires by a cold or unsympathising word, I would desire to hail them as indications of life and as containing the promise of a blessing.

For the particulars of the plan sketched out in your letter a good deal of consideration, I think, would be needed. Such points as these occur to me:—

1st. I do not see why the *various* institutions of which you speak should be essentially united.

2nd. If not so united, I think the expediency of starting all *at once* questionable.

3rd. How are the 'ladies' to be employed? Would they labour in the schools, neighbourhood, &c., as desired? Would they have a *common* table? Would the 'Sisters' board with them? Would they mix in general society?

These and a multitude of questions of detail occur to me. Again, would it not be more like the growth of the mustard-seed if, instead of *starting* with lands, houses, &c. (all of which must catch the world's eye, and perhaps, at first, cause alarm to the good from past abuses of things bearing some outward resemblance to these), *if*, instead of these, 3, 4, or any such number of 'ladies,' were first to hire some house near a church such as you glance at, to live in common and *under rule*, to board with them 'Sisters of Charity,' to overlook the schools and visit, and then by degrees to build one and another of such institutions as they were able to add, and let the whole grow into its perfectness by gradual increment? On all these points I should be glad to know your mind. A deep devotion, a life alienated from the world, submission, many daily prayers, self-denial, and abounding works of charity—these are what we aim at producing, and no doubt God would give us hearts longing for such a service. But how to bring this good work to bear must require much thought and many prayers.

Should you think it desirable, I will gladly take an opportunity of talking the matter fully over with you. On Tuesday I am going into close residence at Winchester, and I cannot, therefore, offer at present to come to Brighton; but I should be very glad to receive you at Winchester, or, after a few weeks, I would meet you for conversation at Chichester or even at Brighton. In the meantime, you will perhaps, if you are not able to come to Winchester, allow me to hear something further as to the points which I have mentioned. Ever, my dear Madam, believe me to be most truly your's,

S. WILBERFORCE.

And again, shortly after, to the same:—

(*Private.*)

The Close, Winchester, Feb. 5, 1844.

My dear Madam,—Your note reached me here, where I am now in residence, yesterday; and I hasten to reply to it.

You will be, I am sure, prepared by the close of my last letter for my entering in any degree upon your plan with the greatest caution; and on this account I must say that I do not think we are yet at all ready to announce the plan to friends; certainly not with my name at present in connexion with it.

You must let me remind you that we cannot now bring any such scheme into operation with the same safety that we could have had a few years ago. The strange doctrines and the startling practices of the party, whom for shortness I will call the 'Tract-writer-party,' have brought many most unobjectionable things under a just suspicion, and we have no right to endanger great attempts by letting them come before the Church in any suspicious garb. On this account it will be, I am sure, essential to our success, first, to begin with small and unobserved steps; to let all we do *grow* as much as possible out of what we have in the Church round us; and, secondly, not only to be ourselves heartily attached to the doctrine, and discipline, and spirit of our own Reformed Church, but to secure as our first co-operators persons of the like temper; and to let this true affection to our own Communion, its articles, formularies, and temper, speak itself freely out in our arrangements, and never be cloaked under ambiguous disguises. If it should please God ever to bring such a scheme to perfection, we might then hope to show that a life of great devotion, and self-denial and charity, was not necessarily a copying of the blurred characters of exalted human merit, or of formal or self-righteous asceticism. But we must not disguise from ourselves the difficulty of establishing clearly this difference between ourselves and 'Solitaries' or 'Nuns,' and we must, therefore, walk with the utmost circumspection.

My first practical suggestion from all this is, that we should follow as far as possible the parochial system of our Church; and this would imply to my mind—1st. That before anything is said to any one else, I should communicate upon the whole

subject with the Bishop of the diocese ; and that unless we succeed in securing his full sanction to the undertaking we should proceed no further. 2ndly. That supposing all other difficulties past, and we were starting, say at Elson, we should begin by your engaging a house and coming as charitable ladies who wished to assist in the parish schools, &c. I will not now enter further on the matter, but with your sanction I will apply *privately* to the Bishop. You, I am sure, will feel that my applying to him must itself be kept strictly to yourself in confidence, that he may feel himself at full liberty to express his unbiassed judgment on the whole proposal, both as to its own merits and as to this being the proper time, way, and place of attempting it. Believe me, my dear Madam, to remain ever most sincerely your's,

S. WILBERFORCE.

Very shortly after the date of this last letter an entry occurs in his diary under date February 23, 1844, in which he wrote :—

Off for Farnham at ½ past 3. Long *tête-à-tête* in eve^g with the Bishop. He for closing with Mrs. A. as to Girls' School, Infants' and Boys' Agricultural first.

But no further information can be found as to the result. In a letter addressed to the Earl of Chichester as President of the Church Missionary Society, he remonstrates against a resolution of its committee ignoring, and, therefore, seemingly condoning the action of Mr. Drummond, a clergyman in the Diocese of Edinburgh, who had separated himself from his Bishop's jurisdiction :—

Archdeacon S. Wilberforce to the Earl of Chichester.

(*Confidential.*)

The Close, Winchester, March 16, 1843.

My dear Lord,—You will, I trust, excuse my troubling you with a few lines on the subject discussed on Monday at Salis-

bury Square. The deepest interests of the Society seem to be in peril; and, having never taken an active part in the committee, I am very reluctant to come forward in it on any special occasion; yet to do nothing seems scarcely lawful, and I therefore venture to lay my views before your Lordship. I am told that the resolution of the sub-committee amounted to a determination to 'do nothing which might seem to interfere between the two parties in Scotland, and therefore that the deputation should be sent, but should not preach in the pulpits of either party.' Now, surely, my dear Lord, this will be an entire abandonment of our principles as the *Church* Missionary Society. Only let Mr. Drummond's position be considered. He differs from his Bishop on a point of discipline; and, instead of submitting, under protest, or to censure, he declares himself separate from his Bishop and the Church to which he has belonged, and proceeds to open an independent meeting. Now, is it possible for him more directly to do an act of schism? And can it, therefore, be lawful for us to say that we will not interfere between 'the two parties,' one of those parties being in fact the Church, and the other Mr. Drummond? Surely we are bound to take a distinct line in this matter; and so far from doing anything which may, even incidentally, afford countenance to his recent acts, we ought to remove him from his secretaryship, which he is just as much precluded from holding as is any other Dissenting teacher. In this country, I imagine, no one would question that if one of our local secretaries quarrelled with his Bishop, withdrew from his communion, and proceeded to open an independent meeting, we must give up his services; and I do not see how the fact of Mr. Drummond being in Edinburgh can make any difference, since we all publicly acknowledge the authority of the Scotch Bishops over their clergy as resting on the same grounds with the authority of our own Bishops over theirs.

These views, I confess, were much strengthened by the tone of Mr. Drummond's letters. It must, I think, have struck your Lordship that they strongly implied a sense of the bearing of our decision on his own case; that, in fact, he felt that nothing would so condemn his schism as our taking a decided

line in the matter, and that nothing would more tend to uphold him in his present course than our treating him as if nothing had occurred which seemed to us to deserve blame. Surely then we owe it to the great cause of unity in Christ's Church that we do nothing which can in any way strengthen his hands in this matter. I will venture, as bearing on this matter, further to request your Lordship to enquire how many of the majority in the Edinburgh Committee, who voted in favour of the coming of the deputation, are members of Mr. Drummond's congregation, partakers in his act, and desirous of the same sanction.

Nothing but a deep sense of the importance of the question would induce me thus to obtrude my opinions on your Lordship: but it seems to me that to take the line of which I have spoken in this matter will be to sin against God, nor do I believe that this is the result of my holding any extreme opinions: first, because I do not myself entertain extreme opinions; and, secondly, because I see it strikes in much the same light others also. I will only mention one. I happened to be staying with Mr. Gerard Noel at the time when Mr. Drummond's quitting the Scottish Church Episcopal was first made public, and he, though a personal friend of Mr. D.'s, took the same view of it with myself.

Further, I am anxious on this matter, in no slight degree, because of the bearing which I think our decision must have on the interests of the Society. I have subscribed to it now for some 23 years; I have formed associations in its behalf in three parishes of which I have been successively the minister; and through evil and good report I have preached many sermons and attended many meetings for it. I cannot therefore, I trust, lie under Mr. Drummond's imputation of lukewarmness; but I am convinced that nothing, especially under present circumstances, could more injure it both in Scotland and in England, than its *seeming even* to disregard openly the Episcopal authority.

I have only further to beg your Lordship to pardon this intrusion, and to express my earnest hope that God will guide your Lordship, as our President, and us all in our several

posts, that we may indeed glorify Him and help on the salvation of men. I remain, my dear Lord, your Lordship's faithful servant,

S. WILBERFORCE.

The Earl of Chichester, &c. &c. &c.

Here then closes the earlier career of Samuel Wilberforce. He had served, as has been so often noticed, not merely in one or two capacities, but in every position inferior to that of Bishop which the Church of England offers to her clergy. He had been an Assistant Curate, an Incumbent, a Rural Dean, a Canon, an Archdeacon, a Royal Chaplain, and finally a Dean. It is probable that such an experience on the part of a newly-made Bishop is altogether unprecedented.

CHAPTER VIII.

(Oct. 19 Dec. 31, 1845.)

APPOINTMENT TO THE BISHOPRIC OF OXFORD.

STATE OF THE CHURCH AND OF PUBLIC FEELING AT THE TIME—THE OXFORD MOVEMENT—THE MAYNOOTH BILL CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. PUSEY ON HIS APPOINTMENT—LETTERS TO FRIENDS ON HIS APPOINTMENT—CONSECRATION—EXTRACTS FROM DIARY—FIRST ORDINATION—ILLNESS—EXTRACTS FROM DIARY—CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. GLADSTONE ON 'NEWMAN'S THEORY OF DEVELOPMENT'—LETTER FROM THE BISHOP OF ELY, UPON BISHOP WILBERFORCE'S ORDINATIONS.

THE foregoing chapter carried this biography down to the call of Samuel Wilberforce to the Episcopate and also furnished some illustrations of the spirit in which he regarded the new sphere of life and duty on which he was to enter. There can be no surprise at his regarding it with peculiar solemnity and with a deep sense of responsibility. It was true that the storm which had burst upon the Church Establishment at the period of the Reform Bill had by this time spent its force, and that under Sir R. Peel's government things had been settling down, while the mind of the political world had been diverted to other subjects. But it was otherwise as regards that striking movement in the University of Oxford, which had been (humanly speaking) evoked by the politico-ecclesiastical measures, and still more by the tendencies, of the Reform period. The year 1845 was the crisis of the Tractarian movement, and, though Oxford was its centre, the whole country was agitated by it. In the month of February, as has been shown in much detail, occurred the conflict re-

specting Mr. W. G. Ward and his 'Ideal.' On June 30, Mr. Oakeley, then Incumbent of Margaret Street Chapel and a near friend of Mr. J. H. Newman, who claimed to hold the same principles as Mr. Ward, was condemned by the Judge of the Arches Court, his licence revoked, and himself prohibited from officiating in the province of Canterbury until he retracted his errors. On October 8, Mr. Newman wrote to a friend of his intention to ask 'admission to the one fold of Christ.' On November 1 he, Mr. Oakeley, and two others were received into the Church of Rome, at Oscott, by Dr. Wiseman. It was at a crisis like this, and holding the views which have been already so fully set forth, that Samuel Wilberforce was called to the administration of the diocese where lay the focus of the excitement. It was his calling to calm, if it were possible, the ferment of opinion which was raging, and to turn to account, if it might be, the living energies for good which underlay the tumult. Add to this that the political world also had ecclesiastical disturbances of its own. It was during the spring of the same year that Sir Robert Peel had carried his Bill for an increase of the Government subsidy to the Roman Catholic Seminary at Maynooth. The excitement on the subject was enormous, the opposition most tenacious, but the Bill was carried by an immense majority. It was introduced in the House of Commons on April 3, and proposed both a large outlay for the immediate improvement of the College, and the enlargement of its buildings so as to accommodate five hundred students, and also a future annual grant of 30,000*l.*, not subject to the annual vote of Parliament. Out of doors the proposal met with the fiercest opposition. In the House of Commons it gave occasion to one of Mr. Disraeli's bitterest philippics. The fact that Ministers were now ad-

vocating a policy which while in opposition they had resisted furnished Mr. Babington Macaulay with opportunity for the most violent declamation, not against the measure but against the inconsistency of the Government which introduced it. He declared the whole country to be in 'ferment and uproar;' and appealed to the petitions against it which 'night after night whiten all our benches like a snow-storm.' 'All those fierce spirits whom you halloed on to harass *us*, now turn round and worry *you*. The day of reckoning has come, and there you sit doing penance for the disingenuousness of years.' Nevertheless, Sir Robert persevered, and, after a debate which lasted over the extraordinary period of six nights, the Bill was carried at half-past three on the morning of April 19. by a majority of 147. Of course this concession to Roman Catholics in Ireland did not tend to mitigate the general outcry against the Romanising tendencies which were causing so much alarm in England; but the two things were represented as having a connection which in fact was purely imaginary.

Returning, then, to the existing state of things in the Church, and more particularly in Oxford, excited as it was to fever heat by the secession, only three or four weeks before, of Mr. Newman, nothing can be more instructive than the following correspondence[1]

[1] Dr. Pusey's sanction has of course been asked prior to the publication of the two letters in the text. That sanction is given, accompanied by a request that a note be added to explain that, in thus appealing to the newly-appointed Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Pusey was not writing in behalf of the Oxford movement generally, but only stating the case of a class of minds in Oxford who might, he hoped, be retained, but whom indiscriminate language would tend to drive off. 'Residing in Oxford habitually,' Dr. Pusey says, 'I knew that I was acquainted with the state of minds there in a way in which he, who had not resided since his B.A. degree, could not be. I thought then that I could convey to him information which might be useful to him and to the Church. It was not then in regard to the Oxford movement generally, but with regard to a definite class of minds, that I wrote.'

between himself and Dr. Pusey immediately after his formal election by the Dean and Chapter of the diocese. The *congé d'élire* had issued on the 12th of November, on the 15th the Chapter of Christ Church went through the form of the election, and on the same day Dr. Pusey, who, as a Canon of Christ Church, had to take part in the election, wrote as follows :—

The Rev. Dr. Pusey to the Bishop-elect of Oxford.

My dear Lord,—You will, I suppose, by the same post receive y^e^ official address, requesting you, I think, to undertake y^e^ office of Bishop of this diocese. It was a solemn and touching form which we went through in your election to-day, showing what our relation to a Bishop should be.

I could not write at first, being very much pressed by the sermons for Leeds, and you would have felt a letter of congratulation very misplaced. A letter of sympathy is perhaps what you would have looked for from me. It does seem strange, and is, I trust, a token of God's mercy, that, whereas some of the offices of a Bishop w^d^ seem fitted to your natural gifts, you sh^d^, by God's appointment, have been called to a see w^h^ most of all requires supernatural. I hear privately from y^r^ bro^r^ Henry that you feel it so; and so I may y^e^ more venture to express my sympathy with you. One hopes the more that any one will be an instrument in the hands of God, when he feels himself unequal to the office whereto he is called, and so depends the more wholly on Him Who, by His Providence, has called him.

It is indeed a time of intense anxiety; we have scarcely seen the beginning of the troubles with which we are threatened. I fear that the unsettlement is exceeding great, and that there are lurking seeds of doubt very often where nothing comes to the surface. A little while ago people seemed inclined to give up everything out of mere dejectedness. Of course such a loss as we have just had[2] must be intensely painful and perplexing to thousands who owe all their

[2] Referring to Mr. Newman's secession.

religious being to his preaching, or published sermons. Then each unhinges another, and so it spreads until one sees not where it is to end. As far as I can see, what is chiefly at work is, not attraction towards Rome, but despondency about ourselves.

I can well suppose that you, in common with many others, will have been surprised, and perhaps pained, at the line which I have myself taken. I felt, as I have heretofore, that I must risk everything if I was to do anything. I did feel that there was a strong definite position to take in positive attachment to our own Church, and awe at His presence who has guarded her by His providence, and blessed her with His grace, apart from every other question. Love is the real element that binds, not antagonism. I have been led to this by the experience of perplexed minds for many years; I found that controversy irritated and had no good effect whatever upon them; sometimes an hour's controversy with others undid all I had been doing by the irritation w^h^ it caused; on the other hand, I found that the sense of God's gifts in our Church made them calm and happy.

I did not intend to write so much about myself; it is, I fear, misplaced when you must have so many solemn thoughts about yourself and your approaching consecration. Yet you will have distractions, else I would not have broken in upon you; and I hope that anything which brings before you more vividly our perils, may, so far from distracting you, rather promote that frame of mind, which you would now most wish to cherish—mistrust of self and full trust in God.

I know not whether my own sense of our perils has not been deepened by knowing of the sort of persons, lay or clerical, who have been comforted by my letters. Still I have all hope, both in God's good providence which has been over our Church hitherto, and in the actual tokens around us, especially our young persons, and in the deepened frame of mind and reverence so widely visible. But I am sure that, in this diocese, it will need all the wisdom w^h^ any can obtain to rule aright the Church of God.

Yet God's providence has been so wonderfully shewn in

the character of the Bishop whom he has given us these last 16 years, and now again in our not having one such as some with whom we have been threatened, that I trust that your coming here is an act of the same graciousness, and the more, from the little w^h^ your brother H. has told me.

For myself, I can too readily think that any apparent connection with myself would rather embarrass you with many; else it would have given me much pleasure if, in the retired way in which I live, my house could be of any service to you at any time that your duties shall call you into Oxford.

I wish my prayers were more such as I might hope would be heard for you.

Wishing you all blessing, I w^d^ remain y^rs^ most faithfully,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church, Nov. 15.

P.S.—I have written this as to a future Bishop; I know not whether in ignorance; to an actual Bishop its style must have been different.

Along with this letter the Bishop preserved the copy in his own handwriting of his reply:—

The Bishop-elect of Oxford to the Rev. Dr. Pusey.

(~~*Private.*~~)

Alverstoke Rectory, Nov. 24, 1845.

My dear Dr. Pusey,—Your note has remained unanswered until now, from the difficulty I have felt in replying to it. I cannot reply to it without a cordial acknowledgment of the kindness of its tone towards myself, and an earnest return of its desire for our beloved Church of a hearty, faithful, truthful peacefulness of inner spirit. At the same time, I cannot say this without adding what I feared might pain you (and this is what kept me silent); and that, perhaps, the more because anything I say must be incomplete and abrupt; since it would be plainly impossible, if it were not, as it is, unfit, that we should enter into a correspondence on the subject.

I could not then but say, how very deeply (to go no

further back) the letters to which you allude had pained me; and that I cannot feel that the language therein held as to the errors of the Church of Rome is, to my apprehension, to be reconciled with the doctrinal formularies of our own Reformed Church. In saying this I speak, as I know you would have me do, with frankness, and so I would leave the subject.

In one point at least, we can agree—in our sense of the greatness of the common danger, and of the extremity of my own;—and for the prayers and intercessions you promise me, I thank you from the bottom of my heart. I am ever, my dear Dr. Pusey, most sincerely your's,

S. OXON (ELECT).

P.S.—I had written *Private*, but I erase it; as upon consideration I should prefer having my opinion on the subjects touched on in this letter as widely known as possible.

S. O.

To this letter Dr. Pusey replied immediately:—

The Rev. Dr. Pusey to the Bishop-elect of Oxford.

My dear Lord,—Your mentioning y^r^ address seems to imply that you thought I might wish to write again to you, and so I take occasion to explain myself further upon one point. I did not mean, in my last letter, to say anything definite as to my own belief, except simply that I received all which the ancient Church received, and that in so doing I believed that I was following the guidance of my own and of God by her. I did not mean to state anything definitely as to myself, but only to maintain, in the abstract, the tenability of a certain position, in w^h^ very many are, of not holding themselves obliged to renounce any doctrine, *formally* decreed by the Roman Church. And this I knew would satisfy many minds, who do not wish to form any definite opinion on those doctrines, yet still wish not to be obliged to commit themselves against them.

But in this I was not speaking of what is commonly meant by 'Popery,' which is a large practical system, going

beyond their formularies, varying perhaps indefinitely in different minds. I meant simply 'the *letter* of what has been decreed by the Roman Church;' and this I have, for years, hoped might ultimately become the basis of union between us.

And now I hope you will not object to hear how this does seem to me consistent with subscription to our Formularies, altho' it is no other than I said in my defence of Tract 90.

The ground on which I rest is that since our Church, both by the declarations of the Reformers, by her Canons, and by the combined teaching of approved Divines, refers us to Antiquity, the early Church, the *quod ubique*, &c.—then in receiving what is so taught, I am following the teaching of my Church. If then anything in our own formularies seems, according to any received interpretation, to be at variance with that teaching, I think myself compelled, on her own principles, to enquire whether those formularies necessarily require that interpretation. If, of two interpretations, one goes ag^st^ antiquity, while the other falls in with it, I think that I am acting on the principles of our Church in adopting that which falls in with it, and interpreting her in harmony with Antiquity, to w^h^ she appeals.

It is in this way that I have received everything which I have received. Whatever I have received I received on the authority of the ancient Church. I may say too I received some things against my will. My bias was to keep the position w^h^ those in our Church had usually held. I have mentioned the change in myself to *very* few; because what I had at heart was simply the revival of holiness and true faith among ourselves, and I trusted that God in His mercy giving us this 'would provide' for the rest. Practically, when people come to me for guidance, I endeavour to withhold them from what lies beyond our Church, altho', if asked on the other side, I could not deny that such and such things seem to me admissible.

If I may explain my meaning, the remarkable Acts of S. Perpetua and Felicitas, w^h^ was beyond question genuine, contain a very solemn vision, which involves the doctrine of a process of purification after death by suffering, to shorten

which prayer was available. I came upon it while reading the Acts for another purpose; it was great pain to me; the ground was taken from under me. I had interpreted passages (as of S. Basil), as I saw, wrongly, under a bias the other way; solemn as it was, I could not, taking all together, refuse my belief to an intermediate state of cleansing, in some cases through pain. The history was a revelation, at a very solemn time to a martyr, falling in with much which *might* be the meaning of Holy Scripture and very much in the Fathers, and stamping it upon my mind. I could not escape it. The effect has been that I have since been wholly silent about Purgatory; (before I used to speak agst it.) I have not said so much as this except to 2 or 3 friends. Some of my nearest friends do not know it.

In like manner, I found that some invocation of Saints was much more frequent in the early Church than I had been taught to think, that it has very high authority, and is nowhere blamed. This is wholly distinct from the whole system as to S. Mary, as what I before said is from the popular system as to Purgatory. In this way, then, and partly from the internal structure of the Article, I came to think that our Article did not condemn *all* 'doctrine of Purgatory' or Invocations of Saints, but only a certain practical system which the Reformers had before their eyes; and then I came afterwards to see that the *actual* Roman *formularies* did not assert more on these subjects (as apart from the popular system or 'Popery') than was in the ancient Church.

Practically, then, I dissuade or forbid (when I have authority) Invocation of Saints; abstractedly, I see no reason why our Church might not eventually allow it, in the sense of asking for their prayers.

I fear that, by all this, I shall distress you more than before; and yet it is well that you should know the state of our minds, and how we came to it. I have unshaken faith in our position; I believe that God's Hand is with our Church and that all will come right. But I cannot give up my implicit confidence in the ancient Church, nor limit my subscription to it. If our formularies were set authoritatively (*i.e.* by any interpretation of the English Church) at variance with the

Ancient (which God forbid !), I should have to give up our formularies. I have full confidence that it will not be so.

I hardly know what my relation to yourself will be ; we seem in such an un-episcopal state ; electing you, it seems, in a very affecting and solemn way, as our own Bishop, and then, in no relation with the Bishop, when elected, except privately, or in concurrence with the Ordinations. I may therefore the rather speak what I know, that any declaration w^h^ should require people, by virtue of their subscription, to declare, upon the various subjects mentioned in our Articles, against the *letter* of the Roman decrees, would cause the loss of the labours of many valuable and devoted men. And I suppose it is not a wide step, now, between a person's being obliged to resign ministerial duty, and thinking that he has no more place in the Church of England.

I cannot but think (as I said) that it has been by God's providence, that in the Council of Trent, the Bishops there assembled were withheld in so marked a manner from any condemnation of ourselves, and that our Articles, being drawn up before y^e^ Council, were not levelled against it. I cannot but think that Rome and we are not irreconcilably at variance, but that, in the great impending contest with unbelief, we shall be on the same side, and in God's time, and in His way, one.

However, I do not speculate on the future. The present is a time of intense anxiety tho' of hope. I am myself satisfied about my subscription ; in fact, it is no other than that of Keble and others perhaps nearer to yourself. I would willingly give up office, if I thought that my mode of subscription was not allowed ; but I have thought it better to satisfy my own conscience privately, than add to the confusion by speaking publicly on any controversial subject. I did not mean to say so much to you ; but as you spoke of your impression of the untenability of my mode of subscription, I thought I had best, even at the risk of making you place still less confidence in me, explain to you the state of other minds, over whom you will be placed in the Lord, by my own.

Forgive me any pain I give you, and believe me your's very faithfully and numbly,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church. November 27, 1845.

In a few days after his consecration, the Bishop thus rejoined :—

The Bishop of Oxford to the Rev. Dr. Pusey.

The Deanery, December 5, 1845.

My dear Dr Pusey,—My mind has been lately so entirely occupied in ways you will easily conceive, that I have been led to postpone for a few days replying to your last letter. There is, as you anticipated, much in it which is distressing to me. But, before I very lightly touch on one or two of those points, I wish to say a word on the nature of the communication itself.

It seems to me to appertain strictly to the office to which God has called me that I should seek to bear as a Father in Christ (however unworthy) the burden, not of these only, but of all the difficulties, infirmities, or temptations which may harass the minds of any who are entrusted (in whatever measure) to my charge, and who wish to communicate with me. Such therefore I would always be ready to listen to, and if possible to aid, not by controversy, but by a true sympathy and by any practical counsels which God may enable me to offer. Only this must be borne in mind, that such communications stand wholly apart from any judgment or step which I may be compelled to pronounce or take by any public act, in which these same persons may embody the difficulties or errors which they have communicated to me, and from which I have sought by private counsel to withdraw them.

Having said so much, I would add that I am as far as possible from being unable to enter into the difficulties of which you speak. But I must also say that I trace our present evils to a different source, and look for our escape from them, if it please God, to a different quarter from those to which you point. I do not doubt that a longing after greater devotion, after a higher and more self-denying character, and after a greater life of Christian charity, than they met with around them, was the spring which originally moved many of those who have been foremost in the recent movement. But I believe that instead of seeking for these, where only they could be found, in a fuller and more personal knowledge

of God and the eternal relations of the ever-blessed Trinity as revealed in God's Word, they were drawn aside by forms and trappings which seemed to promise them that which they sought in a system which must really obscure the truth to all, and especially to those by whom it was self-chosen. Thus they were led from God instead of to Him. With the appearance to themselves of peculiar self-abasement they lost their humility; with great outward asceticism they were ruled by an unmortified will; they formed a party; and thus being greatly predisposed to it, the perverted bias of one master-mind has sufficed to draw them close to or absolutely into the Roman Schism, with all its fearful doctrinal errors.

I should not speak as I have said that I would, if I did not add that there appear to me to be in yourself too many traces of this evil; of a subtle and therefore most dangerous form of self-will; and a tendency to view yourself as one in, if not now the leader of, a party. This seems to me to lead you to judge the Church which you ought to obey; sometimes to blame, sometimes almost to patronize her; and hence to fall into the further error of undervaluing the One inspired Revelation of God's will given to us in His perfect Word. I would suggest to you, as instances, your abandoning what you had learned as a matter of Faith from your Church's exposition of God's Word on the evidence of an alleged vision, whereas the truth of no one of the Articles of the Faith rests on such evidence, an evidence manifestly open (as the mere facts of animal magnetism may show) to every form of unintentional deceit. Again the same spirit seems to me to be involved in your being ready to give up any one of our Formularies (which refer for their authority straight to God's Word and the Apostolical Creeds), if you, as an individual, think that you can find in early Christian writers contradictions of them.

Will you let me then pray you to weigh carefully the mere possibility of my views being right; and see as in God's sight whether you may not unawares have been led to foster the spirit of party, to shake the obedient reverence due to our Church, to lose sight in some measure of the supreme authority of Holy Scripture and so to hold great truths partially,

and therefore untruly. Should you admit even the possibility of this being true, you will agree with me that not to take any new step, but to watch most earnestly against self-dependence and the spirit or acts of party, is at this moment your especial duty.

I have answered your appeal plainly: I believe that you would have me do so. Only let me further say how earnestly I pray that the God of Peace may Himself heal these our open wounds, and bring together into the clear light of His truth hearts which to His eye may be nearer than they seem to be to us. Should He make me His humble instrument in working such an end, my highest aim will be richly accomplished. I am ever, my dear Dr Pusey, your faithful friend and brother,

S. OXON.

Meantime the Bishop, as by anticipation he may now be termed, had already visited his future home at Cuddesdon, staying there from November 7 to 10, as the guest of Bishop Bagot, and thence writing a first account of his impressions and his purposes to Miss L. Noel:—

The Bishop-designate of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

(*Private.*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 9, 1845.

My dearest Sister,—I hoped to have written to you before, since I left home, but I really have not been able. I came away with Mrs. Sargent on Monday to the Deanery, next day we went over many houses, and at last chose No. 61 in Eaton Place, nearly opposite to Anson's. On Wednesday, I came down to Windsor to Anson's, but a command soon came that I should dine at the Castle. I was most kindly received, had some conversation both with the Queen and the Prince. 'Sit next the Duchess of Kent.' Next day . . . . on to the railroad and here. I was very courteously received by the Bishop and Lady Harriet (Lord Jersey's sister). The palace is not a bit of a palace. It is an old H-shaped house, a rambling sort of country gentleman's house, very small grounds, but a pretty garden, very un-magnificent. There is

a nice lawn, with fine old elms, and a very pretty Church close by. I *am* Rector, and like very much keeping up that pastoral character our Bishops are so apt to lose. There is a curate, who of course must be the effective parish priest during a great part of the year. But it will be my flock. It is 500 *quite* agricultural people. This I greatly like, and think it will be very useful for my dear children. It is, so far, more true country than Alverstoke. The house stands almost on the top of a high hill of sand, very dry and healthy, sheltered from N.E., but quite open, except for the elms round it (150 years old, and noble fellows), and the church, to E., S., and W., with a fine panoramic view, looking on to the Chalk Hills of Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire (Checkendon), and Berks. Behind it is Shotover Hill, rising very gently a *little* higher to the north; one of the noblest *terraces* for walking and riding in all England. The gardens, &c., seem small [3] and productive, and 2 men do them; a little land, but no Manors or anything great—all of which I think quite good for me, and less expensive I hope than if otherwise. I had a walk alone, after church this morn[g], on Shotover, and many deep, and awful, and hopeful thoughts. May God bring them to a good issue.

The Commissioners pay *to* this diocese, not take anything from it, because it is so poor. They are to make it up to 5,000*l.* a year. But for the next 5 years, I shall be very poor, with this 9 or 10,000*l.* to borrow for a starting: so you need not be unhappy about me as if I was going to be rich.

Justin [4] takes the Examining Chaplaincy. I have great

[3] The improvements made by Bishop Wilberforce in the Palace at Cuddesdon were great, but they were at least equalled by those which he effected in the grounds. Up to the time of his becoming Bishop there stood an ale-house in the Palace garden which was the resort of disreputable characters from a considerable distance, and which he referred to in the following extract from a letter of somewhat later date:—

'When I went to visit Bp. Bagot, about one in the morning I was woke by a chorus of yells, howls, shouts, &c., like a perfect Jacquerie under my window. I asked what it was, he answered,—"I suppose the Garsington men going home from drinking in our ale-house" now pulled down, but which then stood in the Palace garden.'

[4] Mr. Trench was often thus designated in the Bishop's familiar correspondence, owing to his having published a volume of poetry entitled, *Justin Martyr and other Poems*. This volume reached a third edition in 1851.

doubts about my other Chaplains. I want to get an Evangelical Churchman if possible. I am thinking of E. Goulburn (but this is quite private), or H. Liddell. Mr. Burder is to be my 'secretary.'

Do you know that 'L'Allegro' and 'Il Penseroso' were written just by here, on the hill behind Shotover?

I must say a word or two about Pusey. I quite believe him to be a very holy man. I could sit at his feet. But then I see that he is, if I understand God's Word aright, most dark as to many parts of Christ's blessed Gospel. *He* now, Henry says, acknowledges, that what *I* said of old in 1837, of his 'Sin after Baptism' view, was quite true, I see that he has greatly helped, and is helping, to make a party of semi-Romanisers in the Church, to lead some to Rome, to drive back from sound Church views those amongst us who love Christ, for another half century, and to make others grovel in low unworthy views of their Christian state, trembling always before an hard Master, thinking dirt willingly endured holiness, &c. Now there must be *some cause* why so good a man should fall into such fearful errors and do such deep mischief, and that cause, I believe, is a great want of humility, veiling itself from his eyes under the appearance of entire abasement. I see it in all his writings and doings. His last letter about Newman I think deeply painful, utterly sophistical and false. He says, for instance, that he does not think himself as an English Churchman at liberty to hold all Roman doctrine; but he does '*not* censure any Roman doctrine,' whilst he holds his Canonry at Ch. Ch., and his position amongst *us*, on condition of signing Articles, one-half of which are taken up in declaring different figments of Rome to be dangerous deceits and blasphemous fables. Then his language about the Ch. of Eng.,-patronising, fault-finding, apologetic; his evident assumption of the position of head of the party since Newman's secession; this very Leeds self-appointed Holy Week; his letter to his own Bishop, all seem to me full of egotistic assumption. I am called abruptly to dinner. May God bless you. I am always your own brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

And of his plans as to Ordinations and Examining Chaplains he wrote thus to Mr. Trench :—

The Bishop-designate of Oxford to Rev. R. C. Trench.
(*Confidential.*)

Alverstoke, Oct. 24, 1845.

My dearest Trench,—Will you kindly aid me in the new work to which I am called, by accepting the office of my Examining Chaplain? I cannot, as most Bishops can, offer you the payment for such services which the power of patronage enables them commonly to bestow, for the Bishop of Oxford has scarcely any Patronage, and none I imagine which you would like to accept. But I believe it to be a post in which you could be eminently serviceable to the Church, and which would not entail on you any services which would be inconvenient to yourself. It would require you to be with me at Cuddesdon 4 or 5 days in the week before Christmas, including Sunday, and the week before Trinity, including Trinity Sunday, and *probably* twice at other times 4 or 6 months before. To myself it would be the greatest pleasure and the greatest assistance possible. There is no part of my new function which is more likely to lead me into painful circumstances than this. . . . . My desire is to render my own presence as Bishop as much felt as possible, looking at it as a time of refreshing of the very highest moment to the ordained. I should *wish* (1) to have a preparatory examination some months before; (2) the week before the Ordination itself, to have the young men with us at Cuddesdon, as much as possible; to see them, get to know them, maintain devotional tone, &c.; (3) I must, with my view of duty, enforce a *bonâ fide* subscription to the Articles. I need not say to you that I should wish to make this as wide as consistently with truth I could; but I could not ordain to a Ministry, to be exercised on the condition of teaching according to certain dogmatic formularies, those who could subscribe those formularies only in a non-natural sense. Now as circumstances stand at Oxford, this is very much the battle-field of opinion; and I cannot but fear that, through Pusey's pupils, I may even be drawn into a painful position to Pusey. I wish you to see all this, not under the

idea that such things can in the least alter a man's heart like your's, but that you may see all. My plan is to write to Archdeacon Clerke as Archd[n] of Oxford, and ask him to continue to hold the same office that he now does, but that I think it right to say that I intend *bonâ fide* to conduct the examinations, and have secured the promise of your services to be joined, if he will kindly render his with them.

My dearest friend, you will not say me nay, but say an early 'yea,' to this request.

We have a great rumour here of your being my successor here. How I should rejoice in it; and to your most secret ear I may mention, that if it is not so, it will not be from my having let *one day* pass after accepting the Bishopric without urging this arrangement through the best channel I could reach. But I fear it is far too good to be true. If there be truth in it, pray confirm it, and speak to my Lord *at once* for Burrows to follow you.

Most Private.—Great exertions have been made to secure something for Maurice in all these changes. My hope is, that they will not end without the offer of a Canonry of Ch. Church coming to his door. I think this would be the best place for him, as it would break no London connection, would give the needful money, residence, and a most useful position there. May God grant it. The very day the offer came to me, I set Bunsen at work. Your ever affectionate friend,

S. WILBERFORCE.

Looking forward to his consecration, which was ultimately fixed for Sunday, November 30, St. Andrew's day, at the chapel of Lambeth Palace, he wrote to his brother Robert to request him to be the preacher on the occasion :—

The Bishop-designate of Oxford to Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce.

Alverstoke, Oct. 25, 1845.

My dearest Brother,—I am very desirous that you should preach my Consecration sermon. Will you do so? I should greatly like thus joining you with the most solemn season of my whole life. It will be some time early in December, and

I hope you could so arrange as to stay a few days longer, and go down to Cuddesdon, where I must then immediately establish myself, preparatory to my first Ordination.

But now, dearest R., having, as I hope, got your consent, I want to speak with entire openness, and as I could not to ——, about the sermon. You know how many eyes will be just now on me, and how great evil anything which raised a suspicion of my now revealing a secret leaning towards Tractarianism would do. I, who know my own deep aversion from that whole scheme, know of course that in time all such misapprehensions must clear off; but it would be a needless hindrance to my well starting to have such a suspicion aroused.

Now I think the mere fact of *your* preaching in the present angry and fretful state of men's minds will a little arouse such suspicion. But for that I care not a button, if you will only take such a side of such a subject for your sermon as will, when it is published, sweep away the imputation. And in this way it may be even of service, in our several spheres, to both of us. It will, both before the audience and the church, mark what is your opinion. You will easily understand my meaning, *e.g.* instead of taking as your prominent subject the 'Succession,' its side against Dissent, Baptismal Regeneration, and its side against Low Churchmen—on which your audience of that day at least will not need any additional assurance—you would take the more spiritual view of the Ministry; its one work to testify of Christ, and converting souls through the might of His Name; the full and undoubting allegiance of your own mind to our Church; your no sympathy with the morbid leer towards Rome; your no absolute damning foreign Protestants, &c.; if, in short, you could give *me* such an address as I need to stir me up to believe, to be humble, and watchful, and laborious for souls—and *do!* I have no doubt that, in many ways, a great blessing will come from your preaching to us. Very much the tone of your last Charge is what I mean. I shall long for your answer to this, beloved brother. Ever believe me to be your most affectionately attached brother,

S. WILBERFORCE.

The Archdeacon did preach the sermon, and, though it is anticipating a little, it may here be said that it was a most able and thoughtful address upon the calling and responsibilities of the Episcopate. It set out with a general statement that whereas civil society rests ultimately on force, spiritual society rests on the gifts entrusted to those who bear its 'Orders;' and thence it deduced the great responsibility of the clerical calling, and specially that of the Bishops, upon whom whatsoever responsibilities do not fall upon the inferior clergy must necessarily rest. 'Bishops are set forth *last*,' the ultimate wrestlers in the Church's war. The sermon concluded with an elaborate statement of the essential qualifications for the Episcopal office. Among these it is interesting to observe that the Archdeacon assigned a foremost place to (1) keen sympathy with the wants of the time and (2) thorough confidence in the capabilities of society. These two characteristics, he added, were the special attributes of every truly great man, and without them no great victory for God or man had ever been wrought. Words of signal truth and signally illustrated by the character and career of him who that day received his consecration; words which may be taken as supplying the reason why, out of the many able men whom the world sees, so few ever reach real greatness or achieve the results of which they might otherwise have been capable.

On November 23 the Bishop-elect preached his last sermons at Alverstoke as Rector:—'Afternoon, the whole church crammed, but very quiet. I much wearied. Great pain at leaving.' On the 26th the confirmation of his appointment took place at Bow Church. No sooner was this over than in the afternoon he attended a meeting of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, at which his plans and estimates (which were already com-

pleted) for the improvement of Cuddesdon Palace were agreed to. Then, late in the evening, he went down to Lavington, arriving there, as his diary specifies, at 11 P.M., in order to obtain a few days of quiet and meditation previous to the day of his consecration :—

Thursday, Nov. 27.—A good deal of time alone. Prayer, and reading 'Enchiridion,' given me by H. E. M., and thought. Some large views of service, but on the whole much *ariditas.* Lord help me.

Friday, 28.—Spent my day as yesterday, and I hope with some profit. At night more perception than is common with me, of the great end of life being to serve God in *His* way. Some laying hold of the 'promise of life which is in Christ Jesus,' of the pledge that I may be strong in the grace which is in Him.

O Lord, cleave the heavens, and come down. Be with me. Yea, overshadow me; yea, fill me with Thyself for Christ's sake.

Sat. 29.—At early communion with Manning after private prayer. Service. Time alone. Then with Manning to London. R. &c. there. Prevost and Trench, and others flocked in.

Sunday, November 30, 1845.—Up early and much in prayer. At 11, to Lambeth. The service very overwhelming; sometimes almost above my endurance. I trust that I did in very deed betrothe myself for ever unto my God, and that He mercifully deigned to accept of me, even of me. R.'s sermon, in parts, very touching. Came home, and at night much prayer. Many friends round me, and full of sympathy and love.

The consecrators were the Archbishop of Canterbury, Samuel Wilberforce's own Bishop, the Bishop of Winchester, together with the Bishops of London and of Salisbury. Large numbers of his friends were present, and never on any occasion had the chapel been so filled with those who were personally interested in the Bishop-elect. About fifty clergy, chiefly from the Diocese of Winchester, attended in their

robes, and many laity, among whom were Sir Robert Inglis and Mr. J. W. Croker. Mrs. Sargent and about thirty ladies were in the gallery. But no account of his consecration can equal his own few words respecting it, in a letter written on the following Friday to Miss L. Noel:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Deanery, Dec. 5, 1845.

Dearest Sister,—Your kind note found me to-day in bed with a little relapse of influenza. I am now up, but rather miserable. . . .

I felt all Sunday as if you were indeed with us. It was a most solemn time. I was frequently well-nigh overwhelmed, but there was, I trust, a Presence with me. I did endeavour to pledge myself for time and for eternity to *Him* Who is the Faithful and True; and I humbly hope that He did indeed accept me. Even now it sometimes seems a dream that I have passed into that holy state with such mighty ventures issuing forth on all sides. Every part of the Service was most solemn; the prayers, Robert's sermon, with one affecting and beautiful allusion to our beloved father, the consecration prayers, the Archbishop's questions, and then his grave, earnest, subdued tones, and reverend aspect; and behind them I seemed to see the hand stretched out which nails had pierced, and to hear a 'Peace be unto you' which the earth cannot speak. Our dear Bishop was much affected, and I was greatly moved at coming within the rails and sitting down with them. You ask my plans; I get into Cuddesden as soon as possible: I hope by the end of next week. On the next Tuesday Trench joins me; on the Wednesday Archdeacon Clerke, my other Chaplain, and on Thursday the Ordination Examinations begin. They last till the Sunday, when I go into Oxford to the Ordination. I mean to preach the Ordination Sermon. That day I spend at Oxford, and on the Monday I had meant to have had the family down to Cuddesden, but if this rumour of Parliament meeting early in January is confirmed, I may perhaps not have them down, as I must be daily on duty in the House of Lords. Robert,

faithful, affectionate Robert, is still with me, and stays 10 days longer. This is very pleasant to me. Manning succeeds me as Sub-Almoner on the ArchB. of York's appointment. . . . Always I am your own loving brother,

S. OXON.

And here, after the quotation of this touching letter and the account of his consecration, seems to be also the fitting place for some notice of his self-communings during the preceding weeks, and the resolutions which he had been forming for his conduct in the Episcopate. To have introduced them in simple chronological order would have been to weaken their force, inasmuch as they were written at various dates during the whole month preceding his consecration. Some indeed are undated, but the earliest belongs to November 2, while the latest was written during those days at Lavington which his diary has already specified as devoted to preparation and prayer. It only needs to be added that these memoranda were not entered in his general diary, but in a separate book which he devoted henceforward to matters connected with his diocese. It has been already seen how he regarded the great bereavement of his wife's death as a call, in whatever position he might be placed, to serve his Master *only* without thought of self, and it is worthy of notice that he chose for this special purpose a manuscript book which had once been hers, as will be seen from the opening sentence of the entries :—

Nov. 2, 1845. *Alverstoke, Sunday.*—For many reasons I have resolved to use this precious book at this time for myself. But specially because as I cannot doubt but that it was the intention of God to fit me, by all the bitter suffering which has made it *mine* not *hers*, for this to which HE is now calling me, so I would ever remind myself of the lessons I have had above almost every other man to wean me from my love of the world, and to fix my heart and soul on God my Saviour.

I propose marking down here a few practical rules as they occur to me for my guidance. May God help me, for Christ's sake.—S. W.

The first great *necessity* seems to me to be to maintain a devotional temper. The first great *peril*—SECULARITY. To guard against this by self-examination, and above all by living in prayer. Remember that

To serve God
In *His* way
Through His Grace
is all.

Now trusting in God's help, without which I well know by my own experience, that all attempts at spending time devotionally are utterly vain, I resolve,—

I[st] Resolution:

As my universal rule, when not hindered by illness, or some impossibility, to secure at least one hour before breakfast for devotional exercises.

Next, as my great fear is acting with an eye to men and myself, rather than God, I resolve,—

II[nd] Resolution:

Often to set my conduct, principles, &c., in the light of the coming day; and try thus to form the habit of acting under God's eye.

Mem.—To examine myself (1) next morning rather than at night when weary: (2) on my resolutions specially.

III.—To form a regular systematic habit of intercession for my clergy, &c.

Among other practical hints specially needful and necessary, I put down,—

1. *Beware of exaggerating*, either in praise or blame:—guard my conversation more. μὴ διάβολος.[5]

2. Be a 'father in God' to men of *all* opinions amongst my clergy.

Take *time* to answer letters. Give no opinion on hearing one side. Beware of *confiding*—of speaking on feeling.

Nov. 27. *Lavington.*—It is a monstrous thing that there

[5] That is—'Let me not be a slanderer.'

be 'gradus summus et animus infimus: sedes prima et vita ima: lingua magniloqua et manus otiosa: sermo multus et fructus nullus: vultus gravis et actus levis: magna auctoritas et nutans stabilitas.—S. Bernard, lib. 2, *de Consid.* c. 7.

'Multum interest ut *ab initio* eam tibi vitæ formam rationemque constituas, quam in postremum perpetuo sequaris nihilque de recto vivendi modo quem inchoaveris remittas aut relaxes; deinde etiam istud omnino enitares et efficias ut *certas* et *statas* horas lectioni, meditationi, orationi . . . quas neque salutationes interrumpere nec alia externa negotia minus urgentia impedire possunt.'—Carl Borom.

'Præter solitas et statas Ecclesiæ preces certam sibi quantum potuit horam desumet, præsertim matutino tempore divinarum rerum meditationi et orationi impendendam. In quâ oratione non sibi tantum gratiæ cœlestis opem deposcat sed et pro populis suæ curæ commissis se deprecatorem exhibet.'—Conc. iv. Mediolanum. Pars. 3ª. Tit, 'De Episcopo.'

Cautions.—Never to speak of clergy, &c. before servants or children. *N.B.*[6]—*Never talk about them at all.*

Never to hurry men who come to consult you. Mere venting themselves is a relief. The receiving of this a duty of sympathy.

Residence and Labour.—God numbers the Bishop's absent or idle days. Satan *always* busy. Evil sowing; the good fainting; time passing; men dying; Christ coming.

*Mem*ⁿ.—Supreme importance of much study of Holy Scripture.

Examine whether the labours of the office or its temporal advantages endear it to thee:—*onera*, or *in honoribus complacentia.*

Time for retirement before great occasions, *e.g.* Consecration, Ordinations, Synods. The *seclusion* of the Aaronic priests before clothing in holy vesture. Our Blessed Lord whole nights in prayer. The Church 'fasted and prayed.'

The Earthly-minded.—Ad culmen regiminis anhelans, in occultâ meditatione cogitationis, cæterorum subjectione pascitur, laude propriâ lætatur, ad honorem cor elevat, rerum affluentium abundantiâ exultat.'—S. Bernard.

[6] This is in a somewhat later handwriting.

Scripture, Study of.—Ut vero hanc cœlestem prudentiam altè animo imbibat, sibique veluti propriam faciat, ipsas sacras Scripturas sæpius . . . ipsas perlegat meditatu, attento et erecto in Deum animo.'

Nov. 28, 1845.—My object :—I. To serve God.
II. In His way.
All else indifferent. All around the *media* for this. For this thou wast created and redeemed. This is Heaven. To serve anything else, especially thyself, this is Hell. Lord, teach me to love Thy service.

Remember to take from time to time special times for stirring up the gift that is in thee by the laying on of hands. 2 Tim. i. 6.

Remember this day's resolutions when by my wife's grave I seemed parted from earth's pleasures ;—when at night I did cry to God for the heart to love and serve Him and none else according to the promise of life, even to me, which is in Christ Jesus.

On December 10 he did homage for the temporalities of his See :—

Wednesday, 10.—Down to Osborne, in carriage with Peel, Goulburn, &c. &c. Two hours on the road, 45 minutes crossing. Did homage. The Queen evidently nervous. In fly with D. of Wellington, Graham, &c. Peel and Graham in talk. The Duke and Sidney Herbert in much deep talk. Peel much abstracted ; the only thing which seemed to catch his eye some deep draining by roadside. Dined at G. Harcourt's. There, heard from Lord Lincoln, that they resigned last Saturday, and Lord John Russell sent for. Lady Tankerville's and Lord Ossulston's distress. All dark and threatening.

The reference in the last lines of the foregoing extract from the diary requires some explanation. The agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws had for some years been gaining strength, and in the latter part of the year 1845 it had culminated, owing to the failure of the potato-crop and to the consequent Irish famine. The Cabinet

itself was divided. Sir R. Peel was in favour of measures involving the ultimate repeal of those laws. Lord Stanley and the Duke of Buccleuch withheld their support. The consequence was the resignation of the Ministry, and Sir R. Peel's assurance to the Queen that he would give a general support to measures removing restrictions on the importation of corn such as had been advocated by Lord John Russell, but that he declined to pledge himself to support their immediate and total repeal. By December 20, however, Lord John had found it impossible to form a Ministry, and Sir Robert returned to power, Mr. Gladstone taking Lord Stanley's place as Secretary of State for the Colonies. And thus it happened that of the two friends Mr. Gladstone became for the first time a Cabinet Minister all but simultaneously with the elevation of S. Wilberforce to the Episcopate.

On December 13 the Bishop was enthroned in Christ Church Cathedral, then spent a few days in London, and on the 16th arrived, with Mr. R. C. Trench, at Cuddesdon, to prepare for his first Ordination examination, the Ordination itself being fixed for Sunday, December 21, St. Thomas's day, at Christ Church Cathedral. Of his plans for the Ordination he thus wrote the day before his enthronisation :—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Cuddesden Palace, Wheatley, Dec. 12, 1845.

My dearest Sister,—I must write three lines to you the first day that I have been in this house as my own. Mr. Sargent, Robert and I, came down here to-day, to see as to the getting the house ready for next week.

The Ordination has hitherto been conducted thus :—The Archdeacon of Oxford (Archd^{n} Clerke) managed all about it, and examined the candidates in his rooms, as a student of Christ Church, and settled who was and who was not to be

ordained. The Bp. came on the Saturday to Oxford, gave a Charge to the candidates, and next day proceeded to ordain in the Cathedral. My wish has been, to bring all the candidates as much as possible under my own eye, and to secure all opportunities of social, friendly, and spiritual intercourse. Accordingly, I mean to hold the examinations *here*. The candidates come on Thursday morn^{g} at 10. They will be with me and the chaplains all day. Thursday I shall give them dinner. Friday and Saturday being Ember days, I shall have cold meat, &c. put out, which whoever likes may eat, but no regular dinner, and on Sat^{y} eve^{g} we shall all move into Oxford. On Sunday I propose to hold the Ord^{n} in the Cathedral. I shall lodge as many as I can in the house, the others in the village round. Oh, I earnestly trust that God may enable me to make this season a blessed sowing-time; having Trench with me will be a great comfort to me. To-morrow I go into Oxford to be enthroned, and at night go up to the Deanery, coming down here on Tuesday. On the next Thursday I hope to have them come down to me. There will be about 40 candidates, one son of Lady Lyttelton's.

I read the Bp. of Oxford's parting Charge. I should have liked it in ordinary times; but, feeling that his conduct had more than any other secondary thing helped on our fearful troubles and divisions, I could not but regret its tone. I do not like to write about him, but he is most kind and gentlemanlike.

I was down with all the reigning Cabinet on Wednesday. The Queen was much agitated. When she held my hands in hers as I did homage, her hands trembled greatly. No one has a question whether Lord John will be able to hold his ground, or Peel come in again. I must end. We are just going on to Oxford. . . . Ever, dearest sister, know me to be your own truly affectionate brother,

S. OXON.

The corresponding entries in the diary are these :—

Tuesday, Dec. 16—Off for Cuddesdon, Trench meeting me at Reading. Arrived at Cudd^{n} eve^{g}. Preparing for Ord^{n}.

Wednesday, 17.—Getting palace ready. Archd^{n} Clerke arrived, and at night some candidates. Late preparing papers, &c.

Thursday, 18.—At 10 A.M. the great body arrived. Chapel. Then examination. At it all day, and till 3 in the morning, looking over papers with Archd[n] Clerke and Trench.

Friday, 19.—Do., and exposition.

Saty. 20.—Do. Two retired. Early Communion. Charge. In to Ch. Ch. . . . All these days I suffering much.

Sunday, 21.—Saw —— early. Strongly recommends operation. Resolved on it *to-night.* Ordination at 10. Deeply interested as before by ——'s note. In much suffering all day. At night cut. The pain great.

Of the two candidates who 'retired,' as stated in the diary for Saturday, December 20, one was ordained on the Trinity Sunday of the year following (1846), and the Bishop mentioned the circumstance thus in a letter to Miss Noel of June 2, 1846, when giving some particulars of the Ordination :—

> One rejected last time after a great struggle, and now ordained, came and with tears told me he should thank me all his life for that rejection. I have now great hopes of him, and he is going to be under a good man I have found for him for 1 or 2 years before he takes an important family living in the diocese.

And here it must be mentioned that during all these weeks of rapid movement and ceaseless activity—for it was scarcely more than two months from the day when the See was offered him that he was actually settled at Cuddesdon with his Ordination candidates around him —he had been incessantly suffering from more or less serious illness. Three days had not passed after October 14 when Sir R. Peel's offer of the Bishopric arrived, when a severe cold, followed by inflammation, seized him, and he was kept many days in bed and more in the house, so that it was not until November that he was able to travel. How serious this illness was will be seen from his words about it to Miss L. Noel, and from the concluding portion of the touching

letter to his early and life-long friend Sir George Prevost which follows next after them :—

The Bishop-designate of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Alverstoke, Oct. 23, 1845.

I am again, thank God, in the drawing-room, and though most wonderfully shattered, and bruised, and beat down by this heavy storm, yet hoping I may look up. I hardly ever passed through a day so distressed by illness as yesterday. Now, however, I hope I have only *time* to wait to be pretty strong again.

It is easy to see *why* I should have been so visited. Quietness, and the sight of the great White Throne, and the utter uncertainty of all below have been ever before me. I thought when I was so ill that perhaps the prayers of my dearest Friends have brought me this from God.

The Bishop-designate of Oxford to Rev. Sir G. Prevost.

Alverstoke, Oct. 31, 1845.

Dearest Prevost,—I cannot thank you too warmly for your very affectionate and touching letter; and for all its true and most valuable advice. May it please God to enable me to act perfectly upon it. I feel beyond all things the necessity of both points you mention; and, with the aid of His grace, hope that I may in some degree act upon your words. I shall store up your letter, and refer often to it.

Thank you greatly for the Bishop Andrews. It will be a remembrance to me of your counsel and your love. I earnestly return your desire that nothing may ever lessen that love: and this I do all the more because I cannot hide from myself, that with all our affection there ever have been, and still are, views of doctrine, on which we do greatly differ; and I may be so circumstanced as to grieve you, because I act on my conscience. I will only ask you, dearest friend, if so it should ever sadly be, that you will give me credit for acting on my own convictions under the All-seeing Eye, even when I come to conclusions different from yours.

I have been very ill since I last wrote to you, with in-

fluenza and inflammation in the windpipe. I am now recovered, but very weak from the disease and its remedies. The great White Throne seemed very near for several days.

May God bless you, my dearest friend. I shall greatly rejoice if you can send me a better account of Lady Prevost. . . . I am your ever loving friend,

S. WILBERFORCE.

And now, after the manifold excitements of the time and the fatigues of the Ordination, he was compelled again to yield, and for some days returned to London, to the Deanery of Westminster, for further medical advice, which resulted in an additional period of nursing and retirement. The diary continues :—

Monday, 22.—At Cuddesdon. The operation repeated this morning. A day of a good deal of depression.

Tuesday, 23.—Dearest Mrs. Sargent arrived this morning. God bless her. At her persuasion, I went off with her to London. Saw Copeland. He approves of all that has been done. At the Deanery.

Wednesday, 24.—Copeland again. Letters, &c. Kind and affectionate letter from Prevost.

Thursday, 25.—Copeland again. In bed all day. Reading, &c. Letters.

Friday, Dec. 25.—In bed again all day. All doing well. Many letters, &c. Copeland again full of anecdote. 'I had been attending Lord Melbourne for 6 weeks 3 times a day when Minister. No one ever more mistaken. The most anxious painstaking man in the world. Worked all day in his bedroom with secretaries, &c., that he might be able to send bores away with "My Lord has not yet got out of his bedroom."'

Sunday, 28.—In bed most of the day. Copeland. Nearly well. Much private prayer to-day, and reading. Two very striking sermons of C. Marriott's in Leeds volume.

The 'Leeds volume' was that containing the sermons preached at the consecration of St. Saviour's Church, Leeds—a church in which Dr. Pusey was spe-

cially interested, and which attracted great attention at the time. It is further referred to in a letter of the same date as the last-quoted entry:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Deanery, Dec. 28, 1845.

My dearest Sister,—In my solitary Sunday to-day I have read more carefully through Dr. Pusey's sermon on 'the Woman which was a Sinner,' and whilst I think, on this second reading, that there is a great deal in it, both of beauty and of truth, I feel strongly that throughout the whole of it there is the great doctrinal error that 'love effaces sin,' that it is not His work *for* us but His work *in* us which renders us acceptable in His sight. After what I had said to you before I did not like not to say this. I had scarcely noticed this myself at a first reading, so possessed was I with the beauty and fulness of other parts, so rejoicing in his having thrown away his old Novatian hardness, that I scarcely noted this in taking to myself the multifarious good I found in it. The two next sermons by C. Marriott, with endings only by Pusey, on the nature of sin and the sinner's death, seem to me greatly more true and therefore striking. I have had a peaceful Sunday, and I hope an useful. I have had much time for prayer and meditation and intercession. I am certainly much better, am up for some hours to-day, and so go out to-morrow. Ever your own brother,

S. OXON.

And yet further, amid all the hurry of these busy weeks, the Bishop could find time to read and weigh the newly published work of Mr. Newman's on 'The Theory of Development,' which the great 'pervert' published immediately on his secession; and concerning which the Bishop thus wrote to Mr. Gladstone:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Mr. W. E. Gladstone.

Deanery, Dec. 6, 1845.

My dear Gladstone,—. . . Have you seen Newman's book? Acute as it is, perhaps beyond anything even he has

written, I do not think, from what I have seen of it, it is calculated to overthrow the faith of many. For those who believe that the first Divine afflatus conveyed to the Church in the persons of the Apostles all truth concerning God which man could know, and that the inspired Word of God is the written transcript of that entire knowledge which it was but given to the Church afterwards to draw out and define with logical accuracy as heresy created the necessity,—for all such the book has no force whatever. . . .

Mr. Gladstone replied as follows :—

Mr. W. E. Gladstone to the Bishop of Oxford.

Hawarden, N.W., Dec. 10, 1845.

My dear Bishop of Oxford,—In reply to your query, I have read Newman's book with the greatest attention I could bestow upon it ; for I regarded his secession (an event so unexampled) as an epoch in the history of the Church of England. The work makes upon me individually no impression adverse to her claim on my allegiance ; but yet I think it is a book which, for its own sake *and* on account of the influence of its author, ought to be taken into consideration, with a view to answer by one or more of our very best heads.

The view which you have projected in terms so very succinct and clear—though without saying you are prepared to *stand* by it—is as fascinating from *primâ facie* completeness as the theory of development itself. But I am not able to convince myself that ' to draw out with logical accuracy ' what is actually in Scripture, constitutes the whole expository gift of the Church. It is long since I read Vincentius ; but I have always taken it for granted that there is necessarily in the Church some power of ' development ; ' and he gives certain limits of that power. I feel that the Church of England has effectually confined this power from extravagating by the terms of the sixth Article : that explanation and definition founded thereon constitute its principal elements ; and I have never felt that in matters *de fide* the Church had exercised anything more. Still the very fact of founding the *Homoousion* upon ' I and My Father are ἕν ' (which I suppose is the nearest

Scripture authority) involves a spiritual gift; and therefore requires more than logical accuracy. Then, I grant, it becomes extremely difficult to draw out with precision against Newman the limits of this power; but it would be a noble work, and I am sure Bishop Butler could do it if he were among us. In *fragments* many things have occurred to me that might be said; but one would like to see a constructive as well as destructive answer.

In some points of view it seems to me that this book establishes positions most important for us. It seems almost to give up the question as to the nearest claim to the possession of spiritual doctrine; and to reduce the whole claim of the Church of Rome from determinate to indeterminate, from Divine to Providential. I do not think the author of 'Unam Sanctam' would have thanked him for this kind of Popery. On the other hand, I am beyond measure grieved and shocked at the doctrine of the book concerning the Blessed Virgin. If you have not seen this, pray observe the running titles of pp. 403, 5, 7, 9; and read pp. 405-7 and 444, &c. I should delight to come to Cuddesdon as your guest. Pray believe me always most sincerely your's,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

With the last entry in the diary the record of this year, so eventful in so many ways, shall close. But as so many of the later extracts from his letters have touched upon Bishop Wilberforce's deep anxiety regarding his Ordinations, and as they were always occasions which drew out his powers to the utmost, it is thought that this is the most proper place for the insertion of the following valuable letter from one who was for many years associated with him in their conduct, namely, Dr. Woodford, the present Bishop of Ely:—

Wednesday, Dec. 31, 1845.—Morn^{g}, many engagements in London, till too late to be off by 2. Off by 5. At Cuddesdon by 9,—travelling down with Mrs. Sargent, Herbert, and B. James. A dark, dreary drive, but all safe, thank God. So ends this year. A year greatly marked by God's mercies, if I

be faithful in the state to which I am raised. Endeavoured to draw my family in chapel to praise and thanksgiving. O THOU who hast been so gracious unto me, bless me and mine in this new residence.

A windy, stormy, violent night:—so my diocese all dark and cloudy, but ONE directs. One is over all. To him I dare to say, My Father keep us. Amen.

Letter from the Bishop of Ely upon Bishop Wilberforce's Ordinations.

My dear Canon Ashwell,—I send, according to your wish, some recollections of Bishop Wilberforce's Ordinations. I do so not without many misgivings, for although it was my happiness to be associated with the great Bishop as one of his Examining Chaplains during the long period of sixteen years, and have vividly impressed on my mind both the general character and the lesser details of his Ordination-work, I despair of conveying to others any adequate idea of the pleasantness and solemnity of those happy seasons.

It has been observed by one of the senior clergy of the Diocese of Oxford that the most telling part of the late Bishop's work was to be found in his Confirmations and Ordinations. To estimate aright the force of this remark in regard to the latter, we must call to mind the old system of Ordination, as it prevailed up to his time. The candidates, brought together for examination about the middle of the Ember week, were lodged in the various hotels of the Cathedral city; under no discipline, with no aids to devotion, with no hint that they had been assembled for any other purpose than to test their knowledge of certain books. A single Charge was delivered to them by the Bishop on the Saturday afternoon, sometimes in a drawing-room, sometimes in a school-room, which had been used as the place of examination. Possibly the Bishop appeared once or twice whilst the candidates were writing their papers; but there was no private communication between him and them. Of their individual characters, modes of thought, motives in seeking Holy Orders, he had no knowledge. It is hardly matter of surprise that such a gathering together of young

men degenerated, after the hours of examination were over, into a pleasant re-union of University contemporaries—that the evenings, during which they were left to themselves, became evenings of social enjoyment, if not of boisterous merriment, in which the features of an old College supper-party were reproduced, rather than intervals of solemn thought and retirement.

This is not an exaggerated picture, as many of the elder clergy can testify from their own experience. That to the younger clergy it may appear a caricature, is an index of the happy change which in this respect as in others has passed over the Church. That change is, I believe, mainly due to the Ordinations at Cuddesdon as arranged by Bishop Wilberforce upon his accession to the See of Oxford in 1845. Within the last few years a further advance has been made. He had not, for example, taken the step of separating by an interval of time the intellectual probation of the candidate from the devotional exercises proper to the days immediately preceding the Ordination. But it is comparatively easy to follow and even to improve upon a model, when once set forth, and commended to imitation by the powerful character of its originator, as well as by its own intrinsic merits. The great difficulty is mastered when an old and vitiated system is first broken in upon, and most undoubtedly for the happy revolution in the conduct of our Ordinations, which we have lived to see, we are indebted primarily to the prescience of Bishop Wilberforce in discerning that men's minds were ripe for a radical change, and to his boldness in entering upon it.

The change which lay at the basis of the wholesome reform effected had respect to the social character of the Ordination season. At Cuddesdon the system was commenced of lodging the candidates in the palace. One of the Bishop's earliest proceedings was to make such additions to the house at Cuddesdon as to render this practicable. For those who could not by any means be accommodated within the palace, sleeping-rooms were obtained in neighbouring private houses. Sojourn at an inn was peremptorily forbidden. All, wherever they slept, met the Bishop and his Chaplains at every meal in the palace. It is impossible not to linger for a moment

upon the pleasantness of those meetings: the Bishop presiding at the head of the table with that singular grace which made him inimitable as a host, having a different candidate every time on his right and left, drawing into free and unflagging conversation those more immediately around him, and skilfully contriving by a special question to link in those more remote; the conversation itself perfectly natural, now contracting, now widening in its circle, now gliding by imperceptible steps into a vein of deep earnestness, now flowing back, without a jar, under that genial guidance into a tone more in accord with the hour of relaxation. The instructiveness and cheerfulness both culminated on the Sunday evening, when frequently some Colonial Bishop was present to tell his tale of mission work, or some distinguished clergyman from the metropolis or one of our greater towns would speak of the parochial ministrations or preaching which appeared to be most effective in those more difficult quarters of the Church's varied battle-field.

Another principle of Bishop Wilberforce's Ordinations was to enforce the idea that the days spent with him were to be days of devotional exercises. Hitherto the examination had been the dominant idea. He sought to represent it as secondary to the spiritual preparation. Hence, in sketching to the candidates, on the first morning, what he called the '*lie* of the day,' he always put foremost the hours of prayer and meditation. 'Between these fixed periods,' he would say, 'you will be employed in writing exercises upon theological subjects.' He was very careful also to press upon them to show what they knew not, as well as what they knew, to bear in mind that in what they wrote they would be understood not as merely giving the recognized theological answer to a theological question, but as expressing their own religious convictions, as showing to himself the teaching which they intended to give to their future flocks, and the principles upon which they purposed to administer their parishes. With the same object he impressed upon them that what he desired to ascertain was not so much their knowledge of certain specified books as of the doctrines contained in those books; that the books named for their reading were named

only as the best helps to the attainment of an accurate understanding of Holy Scripture, and the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, their familiarity with which was the real subject of inquiry.

It was a peculiarity of the Cuddesdon system that the examination papers were never printed. When I first joined the band of Examining Chaplains I found myself associated with the present Archbishop of Dublin, Archdeacon Randall, and Archdeacon Pott. All are still spared to the Church, and I may not, therefore, do more than note in passing how the profound theological attainments of one were supplemented by the keen shrewdness of the legally-trained intellect of another, and the singular readiness and accuracy of a third. May I be pardoned for alluding to the complete sympathy and brotherly affection which bound the group together? Each of the four Chaplains came to the Ordination prepared with questions upon all the subjects of examination. The questions were read aloud to the Bishop. The required number were selected, retouched, or entirely altered by his suggestions, and then dictated to the candidates. It will not yet be forgotten with what skill he would frequently by the slightest possible modification lift a question into something broader, deeper, and more searching than its original form.

The conduct of a theological examination, continued through many years, necessarily brings out to the view of those associated with him the inner mind of the examiner, and the gradual modifications, if any, of his opinions. Bishop Wilberforce's theology, like his character, was many-sided. It had affinities with all the great parties comprehended within the Church. Upon the doctrines of Justification and Sanctification, he was in harmony with the Evangelical School rather than with Bishop Bull; in regard to the Sacramental system, he was in accord with Andrewes, Ken, Brevint; whilst the intense activity of his own mind gave the speculations of the Broad Church party an interest in his eyes, which, joined to the affectionateness of his nature, held him in the bond of sincere friendship with some of its leaders. From this character of his theology, it followed as a necessary consequence that he should be exposed to the charge of

inconsistency from all sides; the fact being, that when to one school he appeared to be compromising a truth, he really so spoke and taught respecting it, because upon that special point he was in accord with the opposite school.

My own observation does not witness to any marked change of doctrinal opinion during the years in which I was associated with Bishop Wilberforce, although the varying controversies of the day may have given more definite shape to what he had all along held. Thus the doctrine of there being in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper a commemorative sacrifice, wherein the Church on earth pleads before the Father the atoning death of the Son, imitating in a divinely appointed way our Lord's own intercession above—this doctrine of late assumed, I should say, a greater prominence to his mind. So, again, the identity of the public and private absolution as to potential effect became, perhaps, a more important tenet with him, as he thought he saw a growing disposition to make private confession compulsory. Accordingly, he of late was careful to have inserted in the examination papers a question which should draw forth a recognition of the sameness of power and effect in the three forms of absolution provided in the Prayer Book. Similarly, the controversy as to the authority of Holy Scripture (whilst he most certainly rejected the theory of verbal inspiration), rendered him increasingly careful in testing the candidates as to their knowledge of the radical difference between the two propositions 'The Bible *contains* the word of God' and 'The Bible *is* the word of God,' and in urging the latter as the only adequate definition.

During the last two days of the Ember week, the Bishop was occupied in private interviews with the candidates. He saw every one singly. When he commenced this practice, it was a new thing—and it may therefore be classed amongst the reforms in regard to Ordination work, for which the Church is indebted to him. In order to furnish subject-matter for this private interview with the candidates for Priest's Orders, the following question was proposed to them:—

'What difficulties, from within and from without, have you experienced in the exercise of your ministry?'

The paper containing the answer was given by each man into the Bishop's own hand, and read by him alone. It contributed material for the close searching into character and motives, which marked the private interview. How close that sifting of character was, may be gathered from the notes in the Bishop's private memorandum-book. The same book also affords evidence of the care with which he watched the after-career of those whom he ordained. It is of course impossible to quote freely from such a record; but I venture to give one or two extracts, suppressing names and all indications of personality.

(1) '——. Papers all very poor; examined him *vivâ voce*, and still all so very poor, that I advised him to postpone his application for six months. He deeply grieved. I sifted him for some time, but fear his grief was only for the discredit of rejection, and the interruption of his plans. Pained myself very greatly, by the pain it causes him; but I fear to "lay hands suddenly." Afterwards examined his sermon. This beyond measure poor. Resolved, and wrote to tell him that I could not, this time, ordain him. . . .'

At a later date the entry continues:—

'Came up well prepared comparatively. Much promise. He thanked me heartily and earnestly for sending him back before. Spoke much of the blessing it had proved to him, and now I hope is really well fitted for service. . . .'

At a still later date:—

'With me again. Spoke pleasingly, seems now seriously given to his great work. "All the delay had been most useful to him." "Never been so happy in his life as in the last year, being busy in the work." A man evidently of no high intellectual mark, but I trust sincere and earnest. . . .'

'Died. . . .'

(2) '——. All his papers fair—not more—quite clear about subscription. Pressed him as closely as I could on the need of a renewed heart, and a true indwelling of the Spirit—on his risks and his reckoning. He seemed to be touched—which may God grant for Christ's sake. . . . Is now come up for Priest's Orders. New Testament paper very poor and scanty. Pastoral paper better, but vague. An earnest private talk

with him again, on the need of personal religion, and a heart-knowledge of Christ for himself. I believe that there is real honesty of purpose about him, with no great intellectual power or strong spiritual decision, but on the whole a passable, conscientious man. . . .'

(3) '——. His papers and manner gave an impression of conceit and want of spiritual reality. I spoke to him to this effect with perfect plainness. He was much cast down, but took it *well*. I cannot but hope that there is in him good, which this somewhat rough treatment may bring out. Spoke to him, at much length, of the need of personal conversion and renewal—he seeming very greatly affected. Oh, may I learn and teach together. . . .'

The most prominent feature of the Cuddesdon Ordinations was the series of addresses delivered by the Bishop in the chapel. Those addresses were of two kinds. On the Saturday evening next before the day of Ordination, the address took the form of a written Charge. A volume of these Charges has been for some years before the Church. The previous addresses were in many respects the more remarkable. The candidates assembled on the Thursday morning in Ember week. The first address was then given after morning prayer in the Palace chapel. A second address was delivered at evensong, and similarly on each of the succeeding days. These addresses were always extempore addresses, founded upon the lessons of the day. In earlier times the lessons were specially chosen; latterly the lessons appointed in the calendar were most usually taken. Nor is it possible to forget the marvellous adroitness with which the chapter, when not specially selected, was made to furnish a basis for the required teaching. The addresses of each Ember week were always closely connected, so that a single leading thought was left upon the mind as the result of the week's instruction. The effect of these addresses was shown not only in the attention with which they were listened to at the time, but in the increased devoutness of manner amongst the candidates as the week advanced,—more than once, I believe, in the voluntary withdrawal for a while of some who, having offered themselves without due thought, learnt to

feel under the power of those weighty counsels that the Ark of God might not be touched by careless hands, and so in the deepening sense of their unfitness delayed taking the great vow.

It may be interesting to insert here the subject of some of these Ordination addresses as they appear in the Bishop's notes now lying before me:

'*May* 1863. *General Subject.*—The idea of the Christian ministry—a lengthening out of the Lord's own personal ministry.

'*May* 1864. *General Subject.*—The lessons of the declining Church. 2 Kings, ch. xx., xxi., xxii., xxiii.

'*September* 1867. *General Subject.*—The Church's conflict and secret nourishment. Zechariah, ch. ii., iii., iv., v.

'*Dec.* 1867.—The stability of the ministry.—The beautifulness of the ministry.—The mournfulness of the ministry.—The Divine recognition of the ministry.—Isaiah, ch. li., lii., liii., liv.'

Bishop Wilberforce held his last Ordination at Newport in the Isle of Wight on June 8, 1873. The notes of the addresses then delivered are singularly full and clear. I subjoin the chief headings:—

'*General Subject.*—The Spirit's work in the Christian ministry. (1) In converting the heart of the messenger. Jeremiah xxiii. 16–32; Acts viii. 9–23.—(2) In giving ministerial gifts. Isaiah xi. 1–9; 1 Cor. xi. 1–11 and 28 *ad fin.*—(3) The Commission. Jeremiah i. 1–11; Acts i. 1–10.—(4) Ministerial graces, the Holy Spirit's work. Isaiah lxi.; 2 Tim. i. 6–15.—(5) Perseverance. Daniel xii.; 2 Tim. iv. 1–8.

'The *grand termination*—the world-turmoil done—the mystery accomplished—all that sea of glass which lay spread before the Throne, mirrorizing, measured, compassed, completed—they that turn many, &c.,—the grand end for Daniel, "thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days."—So St. Paul.—(1) Cast in thy lot with the Eleven. (2) Perseverance and gifts—waiting on till given—THEN God gives. Trust to Him—*Work—Pray.*'

I have given the summary of the closing address verbatim

as it stands in the notes. It was the last Ordination address. With the two final words, so significant of his own life, Bishop Wilberforce closed his exhortation to the candidates gathered before him in Newport Church, and in them to all candidates for the ministry. To us reading the notes of that address by the light of what followed, the end which came within six short weeks, there surely seems something of a prophetic character in that solemn lingering upon the thought of 'the grand termination,' 'the world-turmoil done,' the promise, 'thou shalt rest,' and in those latest words of all, his dying charge as it were to his sons in Christ and to the whole clergy of the Church of England, which he loved and served so well, 'Trust to Him—Work—Pray.'

I may, perhaps, be permitted to indulge in a reminiscence, to myself of very solemn interest. The Ordination was on the Sunday. On the Monday I should naturally have left, and had, indeed, arranged to go on that day to Hereford to preach in the Cathedral on the day following. But the Bishop had written with a playful peremptoriness that he wanted me, and that I must get off the Hereford engagement. It must always be a source of pleasure to me that I complied. It appeared that he had arranged to spend the day in revisiting the haunts of his earlier life at Brighstone. Thither, accordingly, we went. He took me to the church, pointed out the alterations made since his time, traced in the churchyard the graves of some whom he had buried. Then, proceeding to the Rectory, showed the garden and house, explaining what he had built, what trees he had planted, pointed out the 'intermediate terrace' up the cliff which had been his father's favourite walk (*vide* 'Life of Wilberforce,' vol. 5). On leaving the carriage, after visiting some other villages which had been his more frequent resort, he turned to me and said, 'This is what I wanted you for. I have now shown you all my beginnings.' On the next day I accompanied him to town. Almost immediately after our arrival in St. James' Square, he started off by himself to a Confirmation in South London. I attended him to his carriage, shut the door of his own house upon him, and saw him no more. That showing his beginnings was the forecast of the end.

I have given you some of the features of a Cuddesdon Ordination week. As I describe them now, they seem common-place enough. You and those who knew the Bishop will at once conceive how the dull current of common events rippled in the sunlight of that loving, genial nature. One might enlarge upon the warmth of the first greeting of Bishop and Chaplains upon the Wednesday night—upon the boyish glee with which he proceeded to assign their quarters to the several candidates, for even to this he looked himself, and when, as generally happened, there were more candidates than beds, and extra accommodation had to be extemporized, the Principal of the Theological College, between whom and the Bishop there was a standing controversy as to whether or not the students should be sent down before the Ember week in order to supply increased accommodation to the candidates, was at a late hour sent away, half distracted, with three or four more men upon his hands than he had been given to expect;—or upon the afternoon walk in the grounds, when the last bit of Church news would be told and the latest question of Church polity discussed;—or upon the ineffable confusion of the breaking-up, when, with the early Monday morning, as though the previous days had been no days of mental effort, the unresting Bishop had to be got off to some fresh scene of labour, while those who had played but a secondary part were rejoicing in the relaxation of what had, even to them, been no inconsiderable mental strain. But I may not encroach more upon your space. My excuse for having trespassed so largely upon it is simply in the fact that I have described things 'quorum pars magna fui.' I am your's very sincerely,

J. R. ELY.

CHAPTER IX.

(1846.)

FIRST YEAR OF EPISCOPATE.

RE-ARRANGEMENT OF DIOCESE OF OXFORD RAPIDITY WITH WHICH BISHOP WILBERFORCE MADE HIMSELF ACQUAINTED WITH HIS DIOCESE HIS IDEAL OF A BISHOP'S WORK—EFFECT OF HIS EPISCOPATE UPON THE DIOCESE HIS PECUNIARY LIBERALITY — AN APPEAL TO HIS 'CHARITY' — TAKES HIS SEAT IN HOUSE OF LORDS—LETTERS—SECESSION TO ROME OF HIS BROTHER-IN-LAW, REV. H. D. RYDER—SPEECHES IN HOUSE OF LORDS DURING HIS FIRST SESSION OF PARLIAMENT :—(1) ON RELIGIOUS OPINIONS BILL—(2) ON BISHOPRICS OF ST. ASAPH AND BANGOR—(3) ON THE CORN LAWS — (4) ON THE SUGAR BILL LETTERS — ENLARGEMENT OF CUDDESDON PALACE — CONSECRATION OF PALACE CHAPEL LETTER ON A QUESTION OF SUNDAY OBSERVANCE THE EDUCATION QUESTION—DIOCESAN PATRONAGE.

WHEN Samuel Wilberforce became Bishop of Oxford, in the year 1845, the task before him was something more than that of infusing life into an already existing diocese: it was in no small measure that of organising and consolidating a newly constituted one. The See, originally part of the huge Diocese of Lincoln,[1] was erected by King Henry VIII., in 1524, who, with the spoils of thirty minor monasteries, converted Cardinal College, founded by Cardinal Wolsey, into the Cathedral of Christ Church, attaching to it a Dean, eight Canons, and twenty-four students. The diocese so created consisted only of the single county of Oxford,

[1] Not to go back to still earlier times, when it had been considerably larger, it may be mentioned that even in the sixteenth century the Diocese of Lincoln included *seven* counties, and the Episcopal Registers show the Bishop to have been assisted by *three* suffragans. The seven counties were those of Lincoln, Northampton, Leicester, Huntingdon, Bedford, Buckingham, Oxford. The suffragans were Bishops *in partibus;* the Statute giving English titles not having then been passed.

and so remained for a little more than three hundred years. In 1836 the county of Berks was withdrawn from the Diocese of Salisbury and added to that of Oxford; a transfer which brought the Chancellorship of the Order of the Garter, which had been previously held by the Bishops of Salisbury, to the See of Oxford, Windsor being in the county of Berks. This took place during Bishop Bagot's episcopate, who might also have received Buckinghamshire. But the story goes that, on making inquiries of Bishop Kaye, then Bishop of Lincoln, in whose diocese Buckinghamshire lay, as to the general character of the Buckinghamshire clergy, and receiving the laconic answer, 'Oh! top-boots or Exeter Hall,' he declined the transfer. The consequence was that the Diocese of Oxford, as it is now known, was first completely constituted when Bishop Wilberforce came to the See, and that his work was not merely to reform but almost to form the diocese.

In 1845 there were no Junior Bishops waiting for vacancies to admit them into the House of Lords; so that the somewhat inconvenient arrangement was then in force, by which the last-consecrated Bishop, however anxious to acquaint himself rapidly with his new sphere of duty, was required to be in constant attendance as Chaplain of the House of Lords. In Bishop Wilberforce's case this attendance had to begin almost immediately after his consecration, as, owing to the political necessities of the moment, Parliament met, in 1846, at the unusually early date of January 22. It has been seen how busily he had been engaged during the month of December 1845; there remained to him but three weeks during which it was possible to be at Cuddesdon before he was summoned to his Parliamentary duties; but in these three weeks he accomplished much. With the exception of one Sunday, January 11, when he

preached at Claremont—'where most kindly received; Peel there, moody and abstracted, yet after dinner kindling into stories'—and an attendance, on January 19, at Windsor Castle, at his first Chapter of the Garter, to be invested as its Chancellor, nearly the whole of this interval was spent at Cuddesdon. There, during these few days, he had found time to receive every one of the Rural Deans of the three counties which now formed the diocese, and singly with each to survey the state and the requirements of his Rural Deanery, so as to have acquainted himself, at least in a general way, with the diocese he had to govern, and the men upon whom, at the outset, he would have to depend. Thus on January 8 he wrote:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

I am having my Rural Deans and Archdeacons with me by one and two, to dine and sleep here, and going through all their lists of parishes and clergy with them, to get to know all the men and the wants of the places, and so get at once an insight into matters which I could not have done otherwise for years. It is such a great help, having been used to the kind of work in Surrey. I have still a good deal to do, but I have gone through a large part.

And again, a few days later, January 16, to the same:—

Yesterday I went into Bucks, to a meeting of the clergy, to do something for setting up Parochial Associations for the S. P. G. in their parishes. There were about 26 present, and it was a most pleasant meeting. I found some *very* pleasing men; men who seemed quite in earnest in the work, and quite Churchmen, and this is so refreshing.

But it must not be supposed that, however cheerfully he wrote, the prospect before him could be any other than one of long, uphill labour. The fact was,

that his conception of a Bishop's work and of diocesan administration was very largely original, or, if not original in the strict sense of the word, at all events it was at that date so unusual as to wear all the aspect of originality. There is no need in this place to repeat all that has been said and written in a hundred ways of the practical abeyance into which the Episcopal office had fallen during the latter part of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the present—days when a Bishop of Llandaff could reside permanently in the Lake district, when Confirmations were few and far between, when candidates were brought by the thousand to the county town, and when the occasion became one of disorder and indecency—days when all the 'examination' of a candidate for Holy Orders would often consist in his being required to write some Latin prose, with perhaps (if in any way known to the Bishop) an inquiry as to the welfare of his father and his family. All this has been told again and again, and told, it may be, so often that the examples to the contrary have been overlooked and forgotten. Exceptions there certainly had been by the time that Bishop Wilberforce began his work. Bishop Blomfield, and after him Bishop J. B. Sumner, at Chester, had exhibited no little energy in that rapidly growing diocese. Winchester under Samuel Wilberforce's own Diocesan had been, if not a model diocese according to present notions, certainly no example of a neglected one. Bishop Denison was stirring in Salisbury, Bishop Otter, during an only too short episcopate, had done good work in Chichester. Still, though these instances, and perhaps others also, ought to receive respectful commemoration, it yet remains true, and ought here to be emphatically stated, that the *idea* of Episcopacy with which Bishop Wilberforce set out, and which through

life he consistently illustrated, was essentially his own. According to him the Bishop was to be as much the mainspring of all spiritual and religious energy in his diocese as a parochial clergyman is bound to be in his parish. It was the Bishop's duty to supply not merely advice and counsel to his clergy, but also that *momentum*, which the sense of real supervision, however kindly and sympathising, always communicates to the mind and energy of the person supervised. It was his to care for the diocese as a whole, to learn for himself where needs existed, to take the necessary steps for supplying those needs, and to take care also that it was known that he so acted, and that he was at all times not only accessible to all men, but also ready personally to investigate on the spot any case that was brought before him. As an illustration of this supervision the writer may here add his own personal experience that during the ten years 1853–1862, both inclusive, of his tenure of office in the Diocese of Oxford, no long period ever passed by, especially while he was yet young in the diocese, without some unexpected call from the Bishop, always most kindly and genial, but as uniformly followed by a careful inspection of the work which was going forward. And, since the Bishop's papers have been placed in his hands for the purposes of this biography, he has been interested to find that in almost every instance these passing calls were noted in the Bishop's diary together with a record of his impression of the condition in which he found things.

Moreover, as to the Bishop's care not only to be, but to be known to be, accessible to all, and ready to attend personally to everything, it should be added that this was but a particular case of a rule on which he not only always acted himself, but which he never wearied of impressing on his lieutenants. The writer,

when a young clergyman under thirty, had been compelled to rebut a charge of the omission or neglect of some duty. The refutation was complete, and at the first he was disposed to felicitate himself on having proved to the Bishop's full satisfaction that, so far from having shown any neglect, he had, in fact, done more than was strictly required of him, and he expected to receive praise instead of blame. He was mistaken. The Bishop turned upon him with—'Then, Mr. Ashwell, I must teach you one of a clergyman's most needful lessons. *Esse quam videri* is a maxim which has its application; but, for a clergyman, the *videri* is essential to his having even the chance of realising the *esse* in his actual work. How are people to be encouraged to come to you for what you are ready to *be* and to *do*, if you do not take care that what you are and what you do be seen and known? And in this case, I, too, as your Bishop, have a ground of complaint in that you have been careless as to letting the real grounds of my confidence in you be manifest to all'—and more to the same effect. The occasion which elicited the above has long since passed out of recollection, but the memory of the warning and of the manner in which it was given can never be forgotten.

Bishop Wilberforce's idea of true Episcopacy is happily now a familiar one: to those of a younger generation it seems a matter of course; and Bishops who fail conspicuously to act accordingly are regarded as falling below the standard of their duty. To this is largely owing the now general demand for the subdivision of dioceses and the increase in the number of Bishops. But it is only the barest meed of justice to say that it is from the ideal of a Bishop's duty which Bishop Wilberforce conceived, which he enforced by his example, and which the brilliancy of his abilities

compelled the whole Church to recognise and to appreciate, that the change now spoken of has arisen. He was an exceptional man, each and all of his many gifts were concentrated upon this one object of adequately discharging the various departments of the office he had taken up; and it is not difficult, looking back across his career, to see how each and all of those gifts contributed to the result. His power of organisation needs no additional remark. His restless activity, at once natural, and by this time rendered habitual by what has been shown of his life, even when at Brighstone, and still more when Archdeacon of Surrey, made a ubiquity which would have been intolerable to most men almost a source of pleasure to him. His manner, naturally winning and cultivated by habit, gave him a power both socially and in dealing with individuals which has never been surpassed, and this, too, was employed by him to the full. His success in winning the territorial laity to an interest in Church work in his diocese and his sedulous pains to conciliate them on occasions when he had to visit their parishes, can never be fully told. None, however, of his leading clergy can ever forget the charm which he threw over the days of annual gatherings of the chief officers of his diocese, or forget the way in which he thereby secured from all a hearty sympathy in his plans, while from the younger he elicited an almost romantic devotion to his person. Moreover, he had the art of making them feel that they were trusted—the one great secret of drawing out the powers of young men of ability and zeal—and the consequence was, that such men served him with an energy which was in itself the highest testimony to him who knew how to stimulate and to direct it. 'I trust you utterly. But you are in a very difficult position, and God alone can enable you to fill it rightly,' were his words to a

young clergyman under thirty, who felt them to the full. And then as time went on, as his Parliamentary reputation increased, and as his political importance developed, all these things reacted upon his diocese, and those who served him felt an added pride in following one who was not only the indefatigable Bishop and the sympathiser in all their difficulties, but also the brilliant orator and one who could hold his own among the foremost statesmen of the day in things secular as well as sacred. It was no small element in the hold which he established over his clergy that to his palace at Cuddesdon he would constantly summon them to meet such celebrities alike from the clerical and non-clerical world as might from time to time be visiting him—occasions when his own wit had free play and drew out corresponding brightness from others—a token of consideration which all men feel, but which to his younger clergy was especially valuable.

Another group of circumstances contributed not a little to Bishop Wilberforce's success, not merely in carrying out his ideal of a Bishop's office, but in placing that ideal so prominently before the Church and the world as to render it the accepted standard which it has since remained. First among these may be placed the fact that his diocese was the Diocese of *Oxford*—Oxford, where he was already favourably known as a preacher—Oxford, to which was drawn so large a proportion of the rising youth of the country, so large a proportion of its future Clergy, so that whatever was done in the diocese where Oxford lay could not but be known and heard of throughout the land. Whatever was done there could not be done in a corner. Then, secondly—especially as the railroad system was by this time developed—there was no difficulty, to a person of such active habits as his, in keeping up his close atten-

tion not only to Parliamentary business, but to all the variety of Church business which centres in London, along with the closest attention to actual diocesan affairs. Had Samuel Wilberforce been Bishop of Carlisle or Ripon, his example as the reviver of the true diocesan system might have been equally admirable; but it might have been far less widely known and appreciated. Moreover, his personality must have been largely withdrawn from the centre of English life, and with that withdrawal one great stimulus to the interest which was felt in his proceedings must have been wanting. As it was, everybody saw the Bishop of Oxford; almost everybody in some sense knew him; everybody heard of what he was doing; his diocese came up to the very verge of the metropolis; his example was therefore close under the eyes of all who were open to be influenced by it. The sphere of his labour was exactly the one to bring his discharge of the episcopal office and of diocesan duty into the utmost prominence, and that with exceptional rapidity. To all this must be added the comparatively early age at which he came to the See. It was an age when in an unspoiled nature enthusiasm is still undimmed, and the powers both of body and mind hardly yet at their fullest; an age which unites the fire of earlier years with the experience of later; one, too (and this is no minor consideration), at which a man can enter upon a great work without the haunting consciousness of a future too brief for its completion. Truly the career of Bishop Wilberforce offers an example of that which is too rarely seen—the concurrence of capacity and opportunity. The result has been what the whole Church knows. Bishop Wilberforce has revolutionised the idea of Episcopacy throughout the whole English-speaking world.

At this point it may not be amiss to give a few

statistical illustrations of the way in which the actual work done in the diocese before and after the beginning of his episcopate tells of his influence. Of course, all such illustrations must in their own nature be very partial and inadequate; yet they serve in some degree to measure the extent to which the energy of its head was communicated to the diocese at large. Bishop Wilberforce occupied the See of Oxford a little less than five-and-twenty years. That diocese consisted, as has been stated, of the three counties of Oxford, Berks, and Bucks. During the five-and-twenty years immediately preceding his consecration, *i.e.* 1820 to 1845, the official records show only 22 new churches as having been built in those three counties, 4 rebuilt, and 8 restored or enlarged.[2]

For the four-and-twenty years of his episcopate the corresponding totals are:—New churches 106; churches rebuilt 15; churches restored 250.

Such being in one point of view the results achieved, it is interesting to read his private notes of 'Agenda' —things which the diocese needed to have done for it —which still exist in his own handwriting as drawn up at the conclusion of those days of conference with the Rural Deans, 'by one and two,' at the beginning of January 1846, almost immediately after his consecration. The words printed in italics were added by him later on as the corresponding object was effected:

AGENDA.

Cropredy to be divided. *Done D. G.*

A Diocesan training college for clergy to be established at Cuddesdon. *D. G.*

A Diocesan school for masters to be built. *D. G.*

[2] The information respecting the churches restored, enlarged, or rebuilt in the county of Bucks being somewhat uncertain, the numbers under these heads may be a little below the truth.

Cuddesdon vicarage to be separated, and Cuddesdon and Wheatley endowed. *D. G.*

A Yeoman's school to be built.

A Sisterhood for Orphans. *D. G.*

A retreat for the more pious clergy to be effected. *D. G.*

The patronage of the See to be amended. *D. G.*

A new church at Stony Stratford.

Ascott and Leafield to be separated. *D. G.*

A new church at Nash. *D. G.*

—— Leafield. *D. G.*

Chancellor's livings in diocese and *extern* livings of Bishop to be exchanged. *Done D. G.*

Waddesdon, hamlet of—church to be built and endowed.

Coleshill in Amersham—a church to be built. *D. G.*

Prince's Risborough—to get in a really moving man.

Headington—to get a house built.

Little Marlow—a church on Hackwood Heath, also schools.

A church on Stroud Green near Greenham.

Headington quarry—separate schools.

Appleford—resident clergyman. *Called for* 1857.

Fencott in Stoke Lyne—some provision for souls.

Fulbrook to be separated from Burford and both endowed.

The reader will not fail to have observed, in this list of *Agenda*, one of those to which the memorandum *D.G.* is appended, respecting the amendment of the patronage of the See. It is no small example of the promptitude which marked Bishop Wilberforce in all matters of business, that as early as November 17, 1845, a fortnight before his consecration, he wrote to the Bishop of Salisbury, from whose diocese the county of Berks had been transferred in 1836, suggesting that all Berkshire livings in the gift of the Bishop to whom the county had appertained should be transferred to the Bishop to whom it now belonged. And the improvement in his diocesan patronage which he effected was truly wonderful. When Bishop Wilberforce came to

the See, both the number and the value of the livings in the gift of the Bishop were extremely small. And not only so, but the local importance of the benefices was even less. Two only of the towns, Banbury and Aylesbury, were in the patronage of the Bishop, while the total number of the livings in his gift throughout his three counties was only fourteen.

Such a state of things cripples a Bishop in two ways: it deprives him of the opportunity of promoting deserving clergy, and it prevents his influencing the diocese in the most effectual way of all, that namely of carefully selecting the clergy for the larger town parishes and more important spheres. How sedulously and how successfully Bishop Wilberforce applied himself to redress this deficiency will be seen from the lists given in the note at the end of this chapter, in which are contrasted the state of the Bishop's patronage in 1845, when he came to the See, and that in 1869, when he resigned it. Those who know the diocese will see that, besides securing a very large amount of patronage, he had obtained the presentation to most of the important *town* livings. Thus he had obtained four livings in Reading, two additional livings in Oxford, two in Newbury, and two in Wallingford; the livings of Witney, and Henley-on-Thames, in Oxfordshire; of Abingdon, Maidenhead, and Wokingham, in Berks; and of Great Marlow, Newport Pagnell, and Stony Stratford, in Bucks. The total number of livings was thus raised to one hundred and three, of which ninety-five were in the diocese. As the total number of its parishes is about six hundred and thirty, this brought something more than *one* in *seven* of the livings in the diocese into the Bishop's gift.

The results of his conferences with his Rural Deans must have been somewhat startling in many quarters,

and the care with which the Bishop at this time preserved copies of his more important letters makes it easy to trace them. Clergy, especially in considerable towns, were promptly called upon to employ the services of assistant curates; additional sermons on the Sunday were required from others; 'sporting clergymen' were urgently remonstrated with.[3] The knowledge that there was now a vigorous Bishop at the head of the diocese led to his receiving all manner of reports from various quarters, so that in many cases, even before the middle of February, he was writing to clergy to send him copies of certain specified sermons, while one unlucky incumbent received a categorical inquiry whether it was true that in his Sunday afternoon catechizing he had taught that 'the Blessed Virgin was the highest of created beings, higher even than the Archangels.' Those of the Rural Deans who were unable to discharge their office vigorously were replaced by others; and the annexed specimen of the Bishop's letters to clergymen whom he wished to add to the body shows that he intended the office to be no sinecure, however it might be unremunerated :—

The Bishop of Oxford to the Rev. ——.

61, Eaton Place, Feb. 16, 1846.

My dear Friend,—I hope to secure your services to my diocese, in the capacity of Rural Dean. My desire is that the Rural Dean should carry out through the district com-

[3] Few things better illustrate the Bishop's vigorous common sense and habit of dealing with each case upon its own merits, than his treatment of this class of cases. So far from objecting to a clergyman's occasionally shooting or hunting, one of his most trusted Rural Deans was known as a sportsman as well as a most efficient clergyman. But the Bishop distinguished between the occasional relaxation of a clergyman whose heart and life were in his work, and that which constituted a 'sporting clergyman,' *i.e. such* an addiction to sport as obliterated his clerical character. The Bishop's early letter-books are full of copies of energetic remonstrances on this head, going to the length in some cases of refusing to license curates who would not pledge themselves to meet his requirements on the subject.

mitted to his charge that effective parochial supervision and inspection, which the size of our dioceses makes impossible for the Bishop, or even for the Archdeacon. I wish that he should keep me accurately informed of the spiritual details of his parishes, that he should visit annually all his churches, and that he should be a centre of spiritual influence to the clergy. This he may be, if God gives him grace to be at once active, orderly, and prudent. You will see the mention of Rural Chapters in your commission, as to which I will only say here, that I should be glad if you would defer holding them until you hear more fully from me upon the subject. The parishes which I think may most conveniently constitute your Deanery are as follow. . . . . I am ever, my dear friend, your's very sincerely,

S. OXON.

So far as the University was concerned, the presence of so stirring a Bishop in its immediate vicinity was regarded with varying degrees of satisfaction. By some among its older members his nomination was heard of with some alarm, in consequence of the reputation for activity which he had already acquired. This feeling was increased when he began his work. 'I recollect,' said one who is now almost, if not quite, the senior member of the University—'I recollect when a Bishop of Oxford never drove into Oxford without four horses and two powdered footmen; and what does Sam do? He gets upon a horse and rides in by himself, without so much as a groom behind him! I met him myself to-day.' The quickness, life, and versatility of the young Bishop were not in accordance with the ideas of propriety entertained by that elder generation. Then there was a traditional jealousy lest the Bishops of Oxford should gain too much influence in the University, which was sharpened by the capacity which was displayed by Bishop Wilberforce, and by the power which he possessed of personal leadership,

which had already been experienced. That the Bishop of Oxford should receive the Heads of Houses at stately dinner-parties, and exhibit a lofty courtesy, was well; but why so much excitement and fuss? Then, again, as will have been foreseen from the specimens of his correspondence, there was the real if somewhat smothered suspicion of the party who had held with Mr. Newman, and who regarded him with unfriendly eyes. But it was not so with the majority. He was not so well known at first as he afterwards became, but there was a general belief in his earnestness and power which made the majority of thoughtful men thankful that he should have been set over the Church in the Diocese of Oxford at such a moment.

Another point in the Bishop's episcopal character and conduct demands particular mention, *i.e.* his conscientious almsgiving; and it is here named the more appropriately, inasmuch as the special testimony on which it is based belongs to the early period of his episcopate. The Bishop's relation to his cathedral city was by no means convenient. Cuddesdon was seven miles distant, and in Oxford he had no definite foothold. And yet from such a population as Oxford contained it could not be but that many an appeal should be made to his bounty, while the above-named circumstances rendered personal inquiry into their genuineness all but impossible. Yet to turn a deaf ear to them seemed in no way fitting. The result was that, as in many other matters respecting the city of Oxford, so also in this, the Bishop used the assistance of Mr. (now Bishop) Hobhouse, then Vicar of St. Peter's in the East and Fellow of Merton, whose permanent position and constant residence in Oxford gave him easy means of investigation. Mr. Hobhouse became, in fact, his almoner for Oxford, and so acted

for several years. It is therefore possible to state with certainty and precision how entirely the Bishop acted on the rule of never turning his face away from any poor man. Not that he regarded this as obliging him to give to all who asked him, but as requiring him to ascertain the true state of each case, and then to act accordingly. Bishop Hobhouse distinctly testifies that for several years his personal experience led him 'to form the highest estimate both of his natural bountifulness and sympathy with misfortune, and also of his faith in the blessedness of relieving it.'

'I have often known him,' Bishop Hobhouse continues, 'even under the extremest pressure of business, stop to read a begging letter, which bore on its face the suspicion of unworthiness, and to direct inquiry to be made; and again, when the report, after inquiry, was laid before him, he would always give the kindliest consideration to it, and always gave the benefit of the doubt to the petitioner.'

'I have in my mind one specific case which is a representative one. After the Irish famine, a poor Irishman, who was struggling to win an Irish degree at Dublin, on the strength of a small income drawn from cottage rents, came to Oxford under the pressure of distress, and applied to the Bishop both for immediate help and ultimate ordination. I was sent to his lodging, and found him with an aged dependent mother living in one sole garret-room. The Bishop continued to "pour in oil and wine" upon this poor couple until the whole circumstances could be ascertained by correspondence, and some one found in Ireland who could administer help to them after their return. I did not know whether to admire most the patient sacrifice of most precious time and thought to the case, or the amount of bounty given from a purse which was con-

tinually strained by the most diverse claims. From what I saw of the Bishop's generosity in other directions, I feel confident that he expended the whole of his official income on charitable and official objects, including, of course, hospitality in the latter.'

Of the tact not unmixed with humour with which the Bishop dealt with applications which, as Bishop Hobhouse above observes, bore the suspicion of unworthiness, the following letter is a good example :—

Cuddesdon Palace, Feb. 24, 1848.

Sir,—I have to-day received a letter from you, stating that you are a faithful man and want money, and that I am rich, and if I am faithful I should give it to you, and so proceeding to much that you had better have left unsaid.

But how am I to know that you are faithful?

If I thought you so, I might be as much mistaken as you are in thinking me rich.

You referred me to some persons who know you. I wrote at once to the one of them whom I knew, and I have commissioned him to minister to your wants, *if he thinks fit*, to the utmost of my power.

More I cannot do, than earnestly to exhort you to pray for humility before God and man. I am, sir, your's faithfully,

S. OXON.

A story, too, of which every detail is capable of exact verification, may be given as an illustration of the Bishop's openness to claims upon his sympathy and charity in cases where most men would have seen no claim at all, and in matters involving the expenditure of far more than money. A young clergyman of somewhat sentimental and lymphatic temperament, but open to high impulses, and equal under some circumstances to doing really good service, was in charge of a district church in a northern diocese. He was married; and his wife, somewhat his superior, and a

woman of rare excellence, was made much of in the neighbourhood. He, morbid and sentimental, and imagining that he had not his wife's sympathy, fell into what must at the least be described as indiscretion, which, though going no further, gave rise to scandal; so that, after the matter had been laid before his Diocesan, he was desired to quit the diocese for three years. This meant ruin for him and for his family. His wife stood by him admirably; by her and by him the case in all its fulness was laid before one who had access to the Bishop of Oxford, and who, having failed in all other attempts to serve them, resolved on appealing to the Bishop's sympathy, wrote to him on the subject, forwarded the whole budget of particulars to him, begging him—no light task—to master them, and asking for an interview. After one or two failures, he called at what he thought would prove a convenient hour at the Bishop's lodgings in Pall Mall. Alas! it was the reverse of a happy moment: the Bishop was already due at dinner elsewhere; the carriage was waiting at the door to take him, while he himself was hurriedly dressing after arriving late from the country, owing to the delay of some railway-train. The card, however, was sent up, and the friend waited. In a few minutes the Bishop passed, all disconcerted by his lateness and his hurry, and almost shouted, arm outstretched, 'I *can't* give you a minute, sir! I can't give you a minute. And this is no case of mine. It is no case of mine.' The response was, 'I know it is no case of your's. Had it been a case of your's you would have known of it for yourself, and there would have been no need for me to bring it before you. I thought you fully understood that it was simply a question of your charity.'

By this time the Bishop had actually reached the

street, but at the word 'charity' he pulled up as if he had been struck, paused, came back into the house, and with a change of expression which the narrator declares he can never forget, and certainly not describe, said in his kindest voice, 'Can you sleep in London to-night?'—and the answer being 'Yes;'—he added, 'Then come to me to-morrow at 10.' Next morning it was found that the Bishop had thoroughly mastered the whole case, and, what was more, had made further investigations of his own, which led him to look with some doubt upon the sincerity of the offender's repentance. 'We fought it all out,' says the narrator; 'I told him all I knew, and all I hoped, and then the Bishop said, "Well, then, what do you want me to do?" "Take him into your own diocese for the three years without a licence,"' was the reply. 'We had more talk then,' continues the friend's report. 'I told him that what the man needed was work, which would leave him no time to be thinking about himself—a place in fact where there was work enough for two, and that if so placed, there was every reason to believe that he would right himself. The Bishop said he would do so; and after due communication with the clergyman's former Diocesan, he told me to write to an incumbent in his diocese who wanted help in a large district with a large labouring population, to tell him the necessary facts of the case, and to say that the Bishop would be glad if he could take him as his assistant.' The result was the thorough restoration of the clergyman's character and usefulness, and he won the respect and goodwill of all classes. 'But,' the friend concludes, 'what touched me most was the high-souled spiritually-minded way in which the Bishop approached and discussed the subject, which indeed might be said to have been no concern of his, and the marvellous

change which was wrought in his worried, anxious, nay, almost angry, countenance when the appeal to his *charity* fell upon his ears.'

On January 22 Parliament was opened by the Queen in person, and Bishop Wilberforce took the oaths and his seat. The Royal Speech announced the approaching relaxation of the Corn Laws, and on the 27th followed Sir Robert Peel's statement of his financial policy. The two occasions were thus mentioned by the Bishop:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Athenæum, Jan. 28, 1846.

I took my seat, as I think I told you, in the House of Lords on the first day of Session. You know how all such real business interests me. But I feel as if I should never take any part in debate; though some day I shall. The impediment of the lawn sleeves must be very great and entangling. Last night I went under the gallery of the House of Commons to hear the debate. I never saw anything received so sulkily as Peel's statement. There was a kind of thundery sullenness, such as even that House, I suppose, had seldom seen. It is altogether a *most* perplexing question. There is so much of vanity about Peel's whole argument, so much of '*I* made this alteration, and this good effect followed, therefore *I* will go on and make another,' as to be quite alarming. Yet if he is defeated, there will be a great accession to the democratic movement, which is *the* threatening thing for England at this moment. . . .

How the future statesman-bishop shines out in the phrase, 'you know how all such real business interests me,' and how characteristic the sense of impatience at the impediment of the lawn sleeves! It was not long, as will be seen—indeed it was scarcely seven or eight weeks—before he made his *début* as a speaker in the House of Lords; and before the Session closed he had

already shown himself an effective debater as distinguished from a mere speaker, but for some little time he seemed to content himself with the part of an observer, and his earliest letters of the period deal comparatively little with public affairs. A couple of extracts from letters to Miss L. Noel, written while reading Mr. Carlyle's 'Life of Cromwell,' then recently published, are all that will excite interest:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 30, 1846.

I have just been dipping into Carlyle's 'Cromwell,' which deeply interests me. Really, in some of his pages, those old Civil War times seem to stand alive before us; and I love to have the truth and life which made Puritanism what it was,—whilst it was that great conquering thing, Conscience, asserting itself,—set before one, instead of the old drivelling dogma-loving hypocrisy in which it ended, and was cast out, or rather hounded out, by weary real honest England.

Again:—

February 8, 1846.

About Cromwell:—Until 1647 he seems to me really, though enthusiastically, godly. I mean that he was ready to part with all for Christ; but that he too little knew, that there was an outer as well as an inward voice, and so might easily be led to do things evil, by mistaking the lying voice of his own inclination for the true voice of God's inward prompting. In this state the great temptations gathered round him, and who can say how far he fell? But his letters to his daughter in particular do, up to that date, imply a simple preference of communion with God to everything else in the world which has amazed me.

Some slight sketch of his manner of life, and a reference to the first occasion of his speaking in the House of Lords, occur in the following:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

61, Eaton Place, Mar. 9, 1846.

By getting up early, I am able to go to an early service at 8 A.M., in the Church of our district, which I very much value. I generally go to every debate in the H. of Lords, and see what is going on, and stay or not, as seems promising. I have refused and avoided a good many dinner invitations, and had several quiet eve^gs. I find that my House of Lords' speech was differently estimated by those who heard it from my estimate, who knew what it would have been, if I had not felt embarrassed by my position, not wishing to say anything which would seem unkind to a friendly Government, or injure great interests. I think Stephen's letter will interest you. His judgment of the speech, I suppose, is from Gladstone and Lord Lyttelton.

Among other things, he was now serving on a House of Lords' committee[4] on Irish railroads—'a sad interruption of all other business'—as he wrote, 'but very curious, and the examinations of the Irish witnesses would often exceedingly amuse you.' Unfortunately he recorded no examples; but how much the 'other business' began to thicken round him may be inferred from another letter, of the same date, where he spoke of 'sometimes 45 letters to write in one day, besides all the *run* of a London life, and sermons to write, and time *to be silent in*.'

It was amidst these manifold occupations, of which the general impression left by his varied but somewhat fragmentary correspondence is that of the most abundant cheerfulness, that the first of those heavy blows fell upon him, whereby, one by one, he was separated, through secession to Rome, from *all* those with whom he had set out on the journey of life. Such a case as his must indeed have been absolutely unparalleled. All

[4] Bishops never sit now on Private Bill Committees. It was otherwise then.

his brothers, Robert, the Archdeacon of the East Riding, for whom he entertained an almost boundless affection and who richly deserved it, William, his eldest brother, and Henry, his youngest, for whom he had obtained the living of East Farleigh, Archdeacon Manning and Mr. G. D. Ryder, his brothers-in-law, and not these only, his equals in years, but his only daughter also, and her husband, all at one time or another quitted the communion of the Church of England for that of Rome, for which, as has been so amply shown, the Bishop himself felt so keen a repugnance. It is easy to imagine, therefore, the pang with which he recorded the first of these secessions—that, namely, of Mr. G. D. Ryder, of Mrs. Ryder, formerly Miss S. Sargent, and also of the sister, Miss Sophia Ryder.

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

61, Eaton Place, May 19, 1846.

We are in *great* bitterness of heart just now. With the utmost precipitation and wilfulness George Ryder has joined the Romanists. His sister Sophy has gone with him. And together, and surrounding her with priests, our beloved Sophie has been beguiled also. The news came as a thunder-clap yesterday. It is most bitter to us; to me and to dear Mrs. Sargent especially.

Setting aside minor occasions, the Bishop took a leading part in four important debates during his first Session; and it is not too much to say that from the first he stepped into the very front rank both as a speaker and as a debater, so that his first Parliamentary campaign was decidedly a brilliant one. On two of these four occasions the subject was distinctly ecclesiastical; on the two others secular. The ecclesiastical questions were—first, that of the repeal of certain of the Acts of Parliament against the Roman

Catholics, for which purpose a Bill was brought in by the Government, known as the 'Religious Opinions Bill;' and, second, that of rescinding the arrangement for uniting the Sees of St. Asaph and Bangor. The political questions were—first, the great question of the day, that, namely, of the Repeal of the Corn Laws; and next, the equalisation of the duties on foreign or slave-grown and colonial or free-labour sugar. On each and all of these the Bishop took a decisive line, and one which clearly foreshadowed the character of his future dealing with questions of ecclesiastical and secular policy.

As to the first-named subject, which came first also in order of time, the Bill was vehemently opposed by the Bishop of Exeter, who took up the traditional Tory and anti-Popery position, spoke strongly on the encroaching character of the See of Rome, objected to humouring 'the delicate liberality of the age,' and moved that the Bill be read that day six months. It was as vehemently supported by the Bishop of St. David's (Dr. Thirlwall), who sneered at Papal power as being too shadowy to call for legislative precautions in these enlightened days, and who denounced the provisions of these antiquated Acts as bringing 'a heavy load of obloquy, discredit, and shame' upon the Church of England. The Bishop of Oxford struck a different note altogether. He supported the Bill as removing penalties which were both 'useless and unjust,' and which he fully agreed were 'a disgrace to the Statute Book.' But he emphatically refused to admit that in so doing he was abandoning any position which had ever been taken up by the Church of England, as would be inferred from what had been said by the Bishop of St. David's. So far from its being true that the Church was in any way

responsible for these Acts, they were all of purely civil origin. As matter of history, the foremost of them all, that namely of the first years of Elizabeth, had been carried *against* the votes of all the Bishops on the Bench. If any objection could be raised against the Bill it was its want of completeness. For, as the Bishop alone had the statesmanship to point out, the admission as a fact by this Bill of the existence of the Pope's spiritual authority over Roman Catholic subjects of the Queen, rendered it a practical absurdity to retain upon the same Statute Book an oath of abjuration, which denied the existence of the very thing which this Bill recognised. In this, however, the Bishop was in advance of his age, and it was not until many years after that the force of his argument was appreciated, and the Oath of Abjuration abolished.[5] The arguments used by the Bishop in this speech were afterwards developed in a remarkable article on 'Clerical Subscription' in the 'Quarterly Review' of April 1865.

The other ecclesiastical measure on which the Bishop spoke was the Bill of the late Earl Powis, for rescinding the union of the Sees of St. Asaph and Bangor, and for the immediate formation of the proposed Bishopric of Manchester. The arrangement against which this Bill was aimed had been adopted on the recommendation of the Ecclesiastical Commission, with the view of making room for a bishopric at Manchester by suppressing one of the North-Welsh Sees, in the same manner as Ripon had been provided for by the union under one Bishop of the ancient Sees of Bristol and of Gloucester. The proposed arrangement was objectionable on the double ground of

[5] In 1858 the Act was passed abolishing this Oath, and substituting 'One Oath for the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration.'

its needless abolition of an ancient bishopric, and of its indefinite postponement of the foundation of the new one, of which every one acknowledged the immediate necessity. But at the time when the plan was formed, the bare idea of increasing the number of Bishops beyond the original twenty-six was looked upon as chimerical; and, if there was to be a Bishop of Manchester, room must be made for him by effacing some existing See. Against this project a persistent opposition had been headed by the Earl of Powis; and in the Session of 1846, in spite of the opposition of Lord John Russell's Government, his Bill was read a second time in the Lords, and passed; but being withdrawn, on the 3rd of August, in the Commons, its provisions did not become law until the following year. The ultimate history of the measure was this. Early in September the Bishop of St. Asaph (Dr. Carey) died, and the opportunity occurred for the union of the See with that of Bangor, under the Bishop of the latter See, Dr. Bethell. Now, however, for the first time, it was discovered that the Act contained no provision for compelling the survivor of the two Bishops to accept the charge of the vacated See in addition to his own; and the Bishop of Bangor declined to accept St. Asaph. The consequence was that the Government must either nominate to the vacated See, on the understanding that the new Bishop should accept that of Bangor also at its next vacancy, a course which would again indefinitely postpone the formation of the Diocese of Manchester; or else must fill up the See without any such stipulation—a course which, after its recognition of the pressing necessity of a bishopric for Manchester, would practically bind the Government to its immediate formation. Lord John Russell chose the latter alternative. Dr. Vowler Short, after some short delay, was

translated from Sodor and Man to St. Asaph, and enthroned on December 24; and in the following year the Diocese of Manchester was constituted, and Dr. Prince Lee consecrated as its first Bishop, under circumstances which will hereafter be adverted to.

In the debate of July 20, the Bishop of Oxford not only pleaded the cause of the North-Welsh Bishoprics, and that of the immediate formation of the Diocese of Manchester, with an ample statement of the facts of the case, but his speech was remarkable for a most powerful, if somewhat sarcastic, exposition of the real office and duties of a bishop. It affirmed the principle, now so familiar, but at that time little thought of, that if the work of evangelisation is to advance, the Bishop must *first* be sent to plan and guide the work, instead of the pastors going first like a scattered army, and then, if indeed at all, for the leader to follow after. It contained also a vigorous plea for subdivision of dioceses and for increase in the number of bishops, pointing out that no addition to their body had taken place since the days of Henry VIII., when the total population of the country was only four millions. The speech produced a great impression, not only in the House of Lords but throughout the country.

On the 12th of June the question of going into committee on Sir Robert Peel's Corn Law Bill came before the Lords, in an adjourned debate. Earl Stanhope led the opposition, and moved that the Bill be committed that day six months. The Bishops were specially appealed to, as guardians of the interests of the poor and of the clergy, to oppose a measure which it was argued must injure both. The Bishop of Oxford spoke especially to the former point, but deprecated the appeals which had been made to the Bench as representing class interests. The Bishops, he said,

did *not* represent any class interests, but they were in Parliament to care for the interests of all classes alike. For his own part he must support the Bill, though in so doing he was breaking away from old associations and old prejudices. The Anti-Corn Law League had won the sympathies of the country, and had wrought a mighty change in the opinions of all thinking men. The present law created an unnatural state of things At this remark great interruption arose, and the Bishop, with the true instinct of a debater, turned the interruption to good account. 'Why, what was a state of nature?' he asked. All legislation of the kind under debate involved more or less interference with the natural order of things, and that was best which brought the smallest amount of injury. The Corn Law was needless, and therefore mischievous. Its repeal would stimulate competition. Competition would necessitate a higher mode of agriculture, and thereby raise, not depress, the condition of the labourer. From this point the speech was a passionate address on behalf of the Bill, as one calculated to raise the agricultural labourers from a state of depressing poverty, with which he (the Bishop), as having for many years been a rural clergyman, was only too bitterly acquainted. It was a speech to be heard, rather than read; and it denounced in no measured terms the hollowness of the opposition to the Bill on the score of sympathy with the poor. What, he asked, did those know of their real condition who only saw them on days of forced festivity, pretending to drink, out of empty glasses, 'health to their landlord and prosperity to agriculture?' The Bishop concluded with a peroration, in which he told the Peers that their power indeed was great, but it could not stand against the rising tide of a nation's convictions, and he besought them

not to place their House in a position in which it should seem to represent the hereditary wealth, but not the hereditary wisdom, justice, and virtue of the country.

In this really great speech the Bishop was stirred to the utmost, and exerted himself to the full. He exerted himself the more, as was only natural, because hitherto he had always regarded the Anti-Corn Law movement with suspicion and dislike; and was therefore the more anxious to justify as completely as possible the course which further consideration had induced him to adopt.

The criticism of a lay friend upon this speech may not be uninteresting. Mr. G. E. Anson, Prince Albert's private secretary, writing on June 15, 1846, expresses himself thus:—

I think the House will be very much afraid of you, and that Peers, clerical and lay, will think twice before they venture to attack you. If I had your talent and your facility of sending home a *personal* shaft, when justly invited, I could not resist taking advantage of it, but I think it a little dangerous. Those men like the Protectionist Duke and the insane —— will never forgive the way you showed them up, and made them the laughing-stock of the House. The 'subtle' man on the Bench, too, will watch his opportunity of revenge. With the exception of these points, which may prove inconvenient to you, I thought your speech able, *well argued*, much to the point, and one which will do your order and your profession much good throughout the country. It was an unselfish and a patriotic speech, and the clergy ought to thank you for making it.'

His fourth serious effort during this Session took place after the change of Ministry, and was in opposition to the Government Bill for the admission of slave-grown sugar on equal terms with the free-labour sugar of our own Colonies. On this subject, as will presently be seen from his letters, the Bishop's mind was for

some time in suspense. On the one hand, he was naturally influenced by his hereditary anti-slavery feelings and convictions. Whatever tended to undo the great work of his father's life, the abolition of negro-slavery, was intensely distasteful to him. On the other hand, he had now given in his adhesion to the principle of free-trade, and it was plausibly argued that, though slave-labour was unpaid, and therefore nominally cheaper, still free labour was essentially more productive, so that the advantage of slave-labour over free in the ultimate economy of production was more apparent than real. But the main argument on which the advocates of the Bill depended was that England required more sugar than the free labour of our own Colonies could supply, so that our own interest as consumers required the admission of slave-grown sugar on cheaper terms. It was clear that this would open a new market to slave-grown sugar. And what could the opening of a new market do but give a fresh stimulus to the production of the slave-grown article, and, therefore also to the slave-trade? It was this consideration which determined the Bishop's course; and, though he was perfectly aware that nothing could arrest the passing of the Bill, he decided on giving it his most energetic opposition. With great skill he turned the argument of the free-traders against themselves. He showed that an equality of tariff between free labour and slave-grown sugar was not an equality of advantage. Slaves were not paid wages; free labourers were. The higher productive value of free labour was hypothetical. Its extra cost was a fact. The effect of the Bill must be not to place the two commodities upon equal terms, but to put a premium upon the employment of slave-labour. The Bishop's effort, after all, was unavailing against a conclusion

which he knew to be already foregone, but his argument was not the less appreciated. The speech, if not so eloquent as that on the Corn Laws, was one of far closer reasoning, involved a far wider range of knowledge and acquired information, and exhibited a greater power of marshalling his facts and drawing his several conclusions to their destined focus. The Bill was carried, but the Bishop was joined in a protest against it by Lords Ashburton, Brougham, and Denman; the protest being grounded not only on the merits of the case, but also on the lateness of the period of the Session at which the Bill was introduced, and the consequent lack of time for its complete discussion and consideration. How late in the Session it was will be felt when it is added that the debate in which the Bishop spoke took place on the 13th of August.

A Bishop's position in the House of Lords is not altogether an easy one. If he takes his part in the debates on secular politics, he is liable to be told that he oversteps his proper sphere; he is liable also to be carried away by the excitement of debate in a manner scarcely consistent with his calling. On the other hand, if he limits himself to matters ecclesiastical, he is in danger of being regarded as merely clerical, and therefore of failing to win his legitimate influence even in purely ecclesiastical affairs. Perhaps no Bishop in recent times has combined the *rôles* of statesman and ecclesiastic so thoroughly as Bishop Wilberforce, and that from the very first. That he did it with full purpose, and yet with a clear perception of the difficulties in which parliamentary debating must involve one bound by the restraints which ought to control a Bishop, is clear from the first of the following extracts from letters to Miss L. Noel, which give his own account of the speeches above mentioned :—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

H. of L., June 18, 1846.

. . . I send you an extract or two from newspapers about my Corn Law speech, because I know they will interest you. Now, about that speech. My hope is to be able always to take *the line* that speech took, of our being there as special guardians of the moral and social well-being of the English *people*. But I never mean to *debate* again if I can help it; and I trust, please God, that having once been led by most unwarrantable interruption to show that I could fight with those weapons, I may in future both be more likely to be listened to and more able to set an example of gentleness when it is felt not to be the gentleness of feebleness but of self-command. Still, I feel the position a difficult one to fill just as I would. The Bishops have so allowed themselves (many of the best even) to be nothing more than graceful appendages to Conservatism, to be mere mutes there, to swell by a bodily, *i.e.* an unreal, presence, a great assembly, that it is not easy for one who feels (as a sword in his spirit) that the social and moral evils of his poor countrymen must be witnessed of before princes, to take his place amongst them without doing things most disagreeable to others.

Prior to the debate on the Sugar Bill he wrote thus :—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

London, July 22, 1846.

I am a good deal disturbed about the Sugar question. I wish, particularly at first, to support the Government. I am clear also, that it is very important at this moment to get them to look to the Church and the Tory side for fair play, rather than to the Dissenters and the Radicals for support. But I do not see how to escape from the force of the arguments which maintain, that all admission of Cuban sugar is a direct bonus to the *slave-trade*, and if so, it must, I am clear, be unlawful for us to give it.

And again, a few days afterwards, but still prior to the debate :—

I am at present convinced—(1) that no extension of free trade could be more beneficial to our poor producers and poor consumers at home than that to the Brazils; (2) that the probable effect of the same measure would ultimately benefit our Indian colonies; (3) that the refusal of this measure will lead either to a dissolution of Parliament or a resignation of the Ministry, both very injurious at this moment—that *I* therefore earnestly desire to support the motion. But that I am *at present* convinced that the opening of this trade would lead at once and certainly to a great extension of the Brazilian and Cuban slave-trade, and that no demonstrated advantages to be gained or losses to be incurred can for a single instant make me hesitate as to giving the most emphatic negative possible to such a proposal. But I am perfectly open, not as you seem to *say* (not I believe to *think*), to wheedling, or intreating, or cajoling, but to *convincing*, that I am wrong in believing that the slave-trade would thus be increased and stimulated; and that *if so convinced* in my reason, I join heartily the movement. I can take, as an honest man to whom God has given a reasonable understanding wherewith to decide, and the call to decide, no other position. I have no more right to pre-judge this than any other question. If you ask me whether I am likely to be convinced, I say that I know so much of the subject that I think it utterly unlikely; but it is my duty to hear before I decide.

And, lastly, on the evening of the day of the debate:—

61, Eaton Place, Aug. 13, 1846.

Dearest Sister,—I am just going to bed very much tired after a good day's work, closed by the Sugar debate. You will, I suppose, read my speech, which was very attentively listened to and really quite unanswered. Two Peers told me they were *convinced* by it; and I hope that it may have some effect in the country. At all events, I have set free my conscience. I kept as close as I could to the *argument* of the case; and I believe I succeeded in wounding no one's feelings in the whole debate, and this is harder than you can conceive, when so much of the *animation* of a debate depends upon

those sparkles which continually occur and which must continually be regretted.

From all this detail of business and politics it is not unpleasant to turn aside for awhile to one or two letters of the same period, written to the same friend with whom he corresponded with equal unreserve, whether the subject were the Parliamentary debates, his spiritual work, or his personal feelings :—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

The Deck of the Steamboat, Southampton Water, July 13, 1846.

Dearest Sister,—I have been hoping daily to write to you since you sent me those lines about my Herbert. But, even if I had not these to thank you for, I must write now; it seems so needful for me to give such a vent to my present feelings. On Saturday morning I went down to Osborne, and had a most kind and pleasant day there yesterday. This morning I resolved, if I could, to go over to Brighstone ; and I took a carriage and went, and am just come back. All was as fresh as if it was yesterday, and I could hardly believe that I should not be called by that voice at every turn. I am very glad I have been, though my heart feels utterly crushed within me. Most happily for me the family were not there, so I walked about alone, and stayed a good while in her room ; and went down to the sea where we all used to go. Really every crack in every cottage wall, every stone in the roadside bank, seemed to be clear and bright in my memory as if I had seen it yesterday. The affection of many of the people was soothing and striking ; some, who had been rather hostile Dissenters of old, being since turned to me. But you will conceive all—how the vision of the past is shed around me, and I can scarcely believe but that I shall soon hear or see her, who gave light and joy for so many years to our days. How miserably poor are all outside additions against such inner wounds! How *only* is there any rest in saying over and over again, 'THOU hast done it, and THY hands are pierced, and THY heart is love.'

The trees *we* planted were some of them quite grown up ;

grown into real trees. Some of M'All's alterations are nice, especially lowering the dining-room floor. Others are not, or I am very much prejudiced in favour of the old. I am going down again on Saturday to Osborne, and have a plan of going home on Monday *viâ* Lavington, with Anson. I can hardly bear the thought of going back to business and turmoil, but so it must be. Ever your affectionate and own brother,

S. OXON.

And a few days afterwards, when the visit to Osborne, spoken of at the end of this letter, had been paid, he wrote again :—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

London, Wednesday.

Dearest Louisa,—I write thus in pencil, because I am sitting for my bust to Mr. Behnes at his request, and not to shock my dearest sister. I have been twice lately at Osborne. Both times I have had most kind and friendly visits, and I have come quite to a clear understanding about the Tutorship. They did exceedingly wish to get me for it, and, therefore, did not like my being made a Bishop. But they thought it unfair to me to let their wish for a future and contingent appointment stand in the way of my present position, and so they gave me up as *Tutor*, thinking that as 'friend and adviser' I might be perhaps in many ways as useful. It is a very great relief to me; for I always felt so much afraid that I should really find the two offices clash and interfere with one another when I came indeed to exercise both. I think you will quite rejoice in this also.

It will be two years more before a Tutor will be appointed, and they have begged me to be looking about for the fit man. It will not *certainly* be a clergyman; though if they can find a clergyman, who in other respects is quite fit, they will prefer his being so.

I have been much interested about the Bangor and St. Asaph Bishopricks' Bill. You will have seen that we carried it. Nothing could be more marked than the general improvement in tone throughout the whole House. My speech was very well received, but very ill reported, as all that debate is,

because Lord J. Russell's Sugar question was the same night in the H. of C., and occupied so much of all political attention. Mrs. Sargent and Ella,[6] and Miss Herthum,[7] were all in the H. of L. the other night. Mrs. Sargent had never before heard me speak, and was very anxious to do so.

I want, dearest sister, to give you a print which is more delightful to me than I can tell you. It is a German print, representing the Translation of St. Catherine after her Martyrdom. The body is reclining in the most exquisite way on 4 angels who are bearing her heavenward. The light of heaven is falling full upon her as she hovers over the dark earth and sea. The countenance is of one 'asleep in Jesus;' and it is the most marvellous likeness of HER countenance![8] Altogether it is to me more beautiful than anything I have seen for a very long time. You will tell me what you wish about its framing. Dearest Mrs. Sargent, who was as much struck as I was with the likeness, gave me my print.

I expect now to be kept here till quite September, unless the Government should be upset, as many think not improbable upon the Sugar question. . . .

As already seen, the Sugar Bill did pass, but the Parliament, which had met so unusually early, sat also unusually late, and was not prorogued until August 28; and with this Session closed also the Bishop's compulsory attendance as Chaplain to the House of Lords, inasmuch as, by the accession of Bishop Vowler Short to the See of St. Asaph in December, he ceased to be the Junior Bishop.

The remainder of the year affords but little to chronicle, but the stimulus, which he had given to diocesan activity, was already beginning to produce its effect, and during the autumn he was called upon to attend the opening of several restored churches and the consecration of more than one new church. The enlargement, and alterations too, of the Palace at

[6] His daughter.
[7] His daughter's governess.
[8] This print always hung in the Bishop's bedroom at Lavington.

Cuddesdon were carried out and completed, by which, from being a house of very moderate accommodation, it was rendered capable, as so many well know, of receiving a large number of guests. This requires the more especial mention, as it formed part of the Bishop's method that he should receive into his house, at the periods of Ordination, all those who were to be ordained, and, besides this, that he should be able to receive and entertain, for two or three days each year, first, all his Rural Deans, and next, all his diocesan inspectors of schools; meetings at which all matters bearing upon their work were brought forward and discussed. Such enlargement in the Palace was rendered the more indispensable inasmuch as, Cuddesdon being a mere village, scarcely any extra sleeping accommodation could be obtained, while its distance from Oxford rendered it necessary to provide such accommodation on the spot. During the same period the chapel was finished; its completion having been somewhat hastened in order that it might be ready for use at the time of the December Ordination. The chapel, it may be added, was dedicated to St. Peter and St. Paul, and the Bishop was assisted in the Consecration (Dec. 10) by the then recently appointed Bishop of Newfoundland, the late Bishop Feild; a large number of the parochial clergy and many leading members of the University being present.[9] The four stained-glass windows in the chapel were the gifts of the Queen, of Prince Albert, and of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. While these works were in process of completion the Bishop spent his time at Lavington, and thence he dated the following letter, the only noteworthy specimen of his letters at this period which has been preserved .—

[9] The sermon on the occasion was preached by the Bishop, and is printed (No. viii.) in the volume of his Sermons, published by Messrs. Parker, in 1877.

The Bishop of Oxford to Rev. Prof. Walker.

Lavington, Petworth, Sep. 4, 1846.

My dear Walker,—I cannot give you any authority to contradict what you have heard, because it is true that the Prince very often does play at chess upon Sunday evening. But before any one is scandalised by it, I think he would do well to inform himself a little more on the whole matter. The Prince, you must remember, has had a Continental education; he has been accustomed to regard Sunday as it was regarded, I believe over all Christendom, until the English Puritans altered the English feeling—not as 'The Sabbath,' but as the great Christian Feast of the Lord's Resurrection, much as we keep Christmas Day. The day is kept by the very strictest and most spiritual German Lutherans and Reformed as a day for public worship and general relaxation. Every pastor in Germany, the most strict Pietisti included, goes after the afternoon service and presides over the playing of a national game, analogous to our cricket, and, as the scoring of this game requires much skill, the pastor always scores. This you may see in every village in Germany. Now, the Prince is a thoroughly sincere Lutheran, and, not feeling our mode of keeping Sunday to be essentially religious, he does not feel bound to conform to it, whilst he does feel that as its mode of keeping with us is now associated with all our religious feelings, he would on no account violate the religious feeling of others. Consequently *cards* are always banished on Sundays, but very often he plays at a round German game of 4 at chess, with 3 gentlemen present. *I* never play, because I explained, that whilst I could not say that I thought the *act* wrong, yet I thought it would be highly inexpedient in me to have it said that a clergyman played. I have never been asked again, but always sit at another table in conversation with the Queen. Of course for a person who believed that it was a breach of the law of God to play at chess on Sunday, it would be wrong not to *protest against* it; but I do not think so. I think Christian liberty leaves such matters very much at large. Of course, I think it far better that persons should find even their relaxation in what savours of heavenly things; but I do not

think the *act* wrong, or the Sunday to be kept as a Sabbath. I believe we as a nation gain much on the one side and lose much on the other by our utterly untrue notions as to Sunday. I believe many are led to spend the day better—here is the good—than they would if they saw games, &c. encouraged after afternoon Church. But I believe that the *untruth* of teaching people to believe that a Sabbatical abstinence is our duty does far more harm, leading many to violate their consciences, giving rules which cannot be kept, making it impossible to distinguish between a sinful disregard of the Lord's Day, and that use of it as a day of rest and gaiety which it is meant to be, specially for the poor and the confined, and so that multitudes, who under a sounder teaching would come to church and give hours to devotion, &c., and then take their children into the country for a Sunday evening, are led to regard themselves, because they do this, as Sabbath-breakers, and so to throw away all observation of a day, the due observation of which they have been accustomed to regard as what they find to be impossible. These were my dear father's views about Sunday, its spiritual character,—the entering into that spiritual character being signally blessed to any one, and a mark of growing spirituality, &c.,—but the non-*Sabbatical* character of it.

I believe that to proclaim these views would do harm, because the mass of the religious people of the land are so pervaded with other views, that it would be really to encourage the irreligious to promulge them; but, when obliged to act upon one's convictions, one must; and I can only say that I feel perfectly convinced there is no sin in such an act, and that, whilst a devoutly spent Sunday evening is a *far higher blessing and joy*, it would not be one whit more pleasing to God if H. R. H. were to sit in an idle judging Puritan spirit condemning others, whose judge he is not, rather than playing at chess, but, on the contrary, much more displeasing to Him.

I have written as fast as my pen will run, for I have no secrets on such matters from you, and you will know what of this to give abroad and what not. Perhaps your best answer to these grumblers is—1st. The universality of such a spend-

ing of Sunday amongst the most pious Germans. 2nd. The impossibility of altering such things except by the gradual alteration of a whole character. And 3rdly. That you know I explained to H. R. H. why I could not join, and was never again asked to do so. . . . Your ever affᵉ, S. OXON.

It was during the Parliamentary recess of the autumn of the year 1846 that the first stirrings of the controversies respecting the details of the mutual action of Church and State, in the matter of elementary education, began to make themselves felt, though as yet scarcely above the surface. National education was part of the programme of Lord John Russell's Government.[1] It was well known that the Government was considering some comprehensive plan, and the air was full of projects. The attention, too, of Churchmen had been peculiarly excited by a pamphlet by Dr. Hook, the Vicar of Leeds, in which he advocated a scheme of his own, not so very much unlike that which became law in 1870. According to Dr. Hook's plan schools were to be universally supported by Government, and the education given in them was to be secular, but he proposed that one day in each week should be set apart for religious teaching, when each denomination should attend to the religious education of the children of its own members. Meantime the Bishops were being consulted by the Government, and in the following letter the Bishop of Oxford shadows out what, at this early stage of the matter, were his views on the questions which were raised, and especially on that of the Trust Deeds of Church Schools :—

[1] The minute of the Committee of Council on Education establishing the system of pupil-teachers, and regulating their education, salaries, &c., their subsequent training in normal schools, and establishing the normal school, afterwards known as Kneller Hall, for workhouse teachers, of which the present Bishop of Exeter was the Principal, bears date December 21, 1846.

The Bishop of Oxford to Archdn. R. I. Wilberforce.

61, Eaton Place, Nov. 17, 1846.

My dearest Robert,—The ground you take about the School Trust Deeds is precisely what I strove for last week. The Bishop of London is the main antagonist, going *more exclusively* than I can do in reserving to the clergyman absolute power over the books, &c. of religious instruction, and giving *his* liberality in not requiring the committee to be communicants. Perhaps, I feel rather less anxious than you on the whole matter from—

1. My strong conviction of the misery of our national schools as instruments of education, except in the rare instances where the clergyman, with a real pastoral vigilance, attends to the boys.

2. My belief that to *recognize* the character of the clergyman is enough (and in some aspects, as forcing him on personal exertion, the best mode) to secure all we want.

3. The importance of not fighting except upon a principle.

4. The importance, if possible, of engaging the laity in the work.

I hope to go down to Fulham to-day, to meet the Bishops of Winchester and Sarum on Lay Reading, &c. &c. &c.

Such, then, was the first year of Bishop Wilberforce's Episcopate. It was a year during which no special difficulties had to be encountered, though it was one which afforded several signal opportunities for the public exhibition of his powers in a field hitherto strange to him. And as such it was a year of marked advance in his career. The same success which had attended him as Rector of Alverstoke, and as Archdeacon of Surrey, had attended also his first Session of Parliament, and he was now one on whom all, who took the smallest interest in the affairs of the Church of England, fixed their eyes with hope and expectation.

NOTE ON THE PATRONAGE OF THE BISHOP OF OXFORD.

When Bishop Wilberforce came to the See in 1845, the following were all the Livings in the gift of the Bishop :—

OXFORDSHIRE.	£
Banbury, V.	—
Burford, V., *with* Fulbrook, P.C.	294
Cropredy, V., *with* Claydon, C., Wardington, C., and Mallington, C.	592
Cuddesdon, V.	440
Culham, V.	100
Hook Norton, P.C.	180
Milton, Great, V.	223
Oxford, Trinity, P.C., *alt. with Crown*	150
Stanton Harcourt, V., *with* South Leigh	136
Wheatley, P.C.	120

BERKS.	£
Bray, V.	500
Sunningdale, P.C.	80

BUCKS.	
Aylesbury, V.	293
Stewkeley, V.	194

OTHER COUNTIES.	
Orton, V., *Leicest.*	218
Sibbertoft, V. *Northants*	350
Welford, V., *Northants*	230

When the Bishop was translated to Winchester in 1869, the Patronage of the See was as follows :—

OXFORDSHIRE.	£
Ascot, V.	50
Aston Rowant, V.	190
Baldon Toot, V.	34
Banbury, V	300
,, South, V.	300
Bourton, All Saints, V.	36
Brightwell, R.	674
Burford, V., *with* Fulbrook, V.	294
Cadmore End, V.	150
Claydon, V.	125
Cropredy, V.	264
Cuddesdon, V.	264
Culham, V.	100
Faringdon, Little, V.	150
Fifield, R., *with* Idbury	278
Filkins, V.	76
Hailey-cum-Crawley, V.	300
Headington Quarry, V.	112
Hedsor, R., *each 3rd turn*	60
Hendred, East, R.	550
Henley-on-Thames, R.	427
Hook Norton, R.	180
Kidmore End, V.	78
Launton, R.	618
Leafield, V.	65
Middleton, Stony, R.	690
Milton, Great, V.	300
,, Little, V.	200
Mixbury, R.	200
Mollington, V.	120
Newington, R., *with* Brightwell, C.	360
Oxford, Trinity, V., *alt. with Crown*	150
Oxford, St. Paul, V.	190
,, St. Barnabas, V.	283
Ramsden, V.	19
Shipton-upon-Wychwood, V.	335
South Leigh, V.	250
Stanton Harcourt, V.	136
Swinbrook, V.	57
Tew, Little, V.	50
Wardington, V.	110
Wheatley, V.	250
Whitchurch, R.	456
Witney, R. and V.	1,290

BERKS.	
Abingdon, V.	300
Ascot Heath, R.	100
Blewbury, V.	300

BERKS—*cont.*

	£
Boyne Hill, V.	200
Bracknell, V.	111
Bray, V.	500
Coxwell, V.	211
Cranbourne, V.	128
Fastbury, V.	120
Grazeley, V.	35
Greenham, V.	118
Hurst, V., *with* Twyford, C.	420
Lamborne, V.	204
Maidenhead, V.	50
Newbury, R.	380
,, St. John's, V.	150
Pusey, R.	163
Reading, St. Giles, V.	602
,, St. Lawrence, V.	276
,, St. Mary, V.	661
,, Christ Church, V.	190
Ruscombe, V.	250
Sandford, V.	150
Sandhurst, V.	150
Shippon, V.	100
Sonning, V.	451
Speen, V.	220
Streatly, V.	276
Sunningdale, V.	108
Wallingford, St. Leonard, R., *with* Sotwell	153
Wallingford, St. Mary, R.	137
Wokingham, R.	300
,, St. Sebastian, V.	200

BUCKS.

	£
Aylesbury, V.	420
Brickhill, ditto, V.	250
Buckingham, V.	465
Chalfont, St. Giles, R.	615
Colnbrook, V.	109
Fingest, R., *with*	180
Ibstone R.	156
Alt. with Merton Coll.	
Hanslope, V.	156
Linslade, V.	160
Marlow, Great	420
Marsh Gibbon, R.	456
Monk's Risborough, R.	353
Newport Pagnell, R.	230
Prince's Risborough, R.	142
Sherrington, R.	631
Stewkeley, V.	300
Stony Stratford, V.	140
Taplow, R.	519
Upton-cum-Chalvey, V.	220

OTHER COUNTIES.

Buttermere, R., *Wilts*	229
Fonthill Bishop's, R., *Wilts*	246
Ham, R., *Wilts*	457
Knoyle, East, R., *Wilts*	851
Patney, R., *Wilts*	225
Portland, R., *Dorset*	484
Stockton, R., *Wilts*	493
Wyke Regis, R., *Dorset*	623

CHAPTER X.

(1847.)

SECOND YEAR OF EPISCOPATE.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL IN POWER PROSPECT OF AN INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE—THE WELSH BISHOPRICS AND SEE OF MANCHESTER—FORMATION OF DIOCESAN SOCIETY FOR BUILDING CHURCH AND PARSONAGES—GOVERNMENT EDUCATION SCHEME—THE BISHOP'S SPEECH ON THE TEN HOURS FACTORY BILL—GRATITUDE OF FACTORY OPERATIVES HIS CONFIRMATIONS—LETTERS—THE OXFORD MEETING OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE—INSTALLATION OF PRINCE ALBERT AS CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE—LETTERS FROM BELVOIR CASTLE AND FROM CAMBRIDGE—HIS MOTHER'S DEATH—LETTERS—MODE OF DEALING WITH DIOCESAN AFFAIRS DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP HARCOURT.

AT the meeting of Parliament in January 1847, there was a general expectation that Lord John Russell's Ministry would prove favourable to Church progress. It was a Ministry which, for the moment at least, dealt largely in hopes and expectations in all directions. How far motives of prudence were responsible for this it is impossible to say; but since the Cabinet had to deal with a House of Commons elected under the previous Government, and since also the Ministers must have been looking forward to a probable dissolution at no distant date, it was obviously most desirable to avoid alarming any powerful interest, and to conciliate all who were open to conciliation. Many 'movements' were waiting to be attended to, and to all the Ministry was complaisant. The ports were to be opened and the Navigation Laws suspended. Education was to be taken in hand at once. Sanitary reform was to be entered upon. The agitation for the restriction of the

hours of factory labour was to be met and satisfied. And so in like manner hopes were held out that the Church was to be conciliated by the concession of its special demand of some increase in its Episcopate. Not only was the Welsh Bishopric to be spared, but four new Bishoprics, *i.e.* three besides that already promised for Manchester, were freely spoken of. Almost immediately after the meeting of Parliament a Royal Commission was appointed, of which the two Archbishops and the Earl of Powis were members,[1] and of which Lord John Russell, speaking in his place in Parliament, said that the object was to consider the foundation of four additional Bishoprics (including that of Manchester), besides the retention of the North-Welsh See. This step on the part of the Government was not taken without previous communication with the Bishops, of which Bishop Wilberforce gave the following account:—

The Bp. of Oxford to Archdn. R. I. Wilberforce.

Cuddesdon Palace, Jany. 9, 1847.

My dearest Brother,—You will like a line or two in strict confidence to hear our doings. It was to receive a confidential communication from Lord John, first that he proposed to retain Bangor and St. Asaph, and next to found at once Manchester and 3 other Bishopricks, the holders not to take their seats in the House of Lords except on vacancies in the existing number of sitting Bishops. Privately, I have reason to believe that Lord John was prepared to concede this, and Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Grey, and some others, but that *George Grey* prevented it by his warm opposition.

We met, the Primate and 20 Bishops, all but Lichfield,

[1] The other members were the Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester, Chester, and Lincoln, the Lord Chancellor (Lord Cottenham), the Prime Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir C. Wood), the Home Secretary (Sir G. Grey), the Marquis of Lansdowne, and the Earl of Chichester. The Commission was dated Feb. 10.

St. David's, Durham, and Glo'ster. And, after long discussion, unanimously agreed to Lord John's proposal in its *primâ facie* appearance. Details to be settled hereafter. The places talked of besides Manchester are Southwell, Cornwall (Bodmin), and Westminster or St. Alban's.

Lord John's second proposal was, 2 paid Ecclesiastical Commissioners; in fact, to get all that power to themselves. We unanimously dissented on the ground that we had not funds so to spend. . . .

And again, two months later, in a letter to the same, written on April 7, the following passage occurs:—

I feel as if it were too long a matter to enter on the Bishopricks, and really *nothing* is known beyond what the papers state. When will you come to London, and let us have a talk over these matters? I am sure Lord J. means honestly by the Church. I suppose we shall have a very early dissolution. Do not you think you could send me up some *clerical* petitions in favour of a Clergy Discipline Bill?—*e.g.* for some Bill like that of last Session amended. Petitions from the clergy stating how *they* suffer from the difficulties thrown by the law of freeholds, &c. in the way of punishing clergy of flagitious lives, and praying Parliament to give such power, would just now be a great help to us. The Lord Chancellor proposes our trying such cases *at the Assizes*.

The reader will not fail to observe the Bishop's expression of confidence in the honesty of Lord John Russell's good intentions. Again and again hereafter, as this biography advances, similar expressions of confidence will be met with in his private and unreserved correspondence, and they recur so frequently as to mark a special feature of his character. Nothing is here intended to cast any doubt upon Lord John's sincerity in the particular matter under consideration, and, indeed, the tenacity with which he held to his promise, and carried the Manchester Bishopric Bill through Parliament in spite of the most obstinate opposition, deserves

distinct acknowledgment; but the readiness on the Bishop's part to be the first to give other people credit for honesty of purpose was so thoroughly characteristic of him that it would be unpardonable to pass it over. And trustfulness towards others is never found in any man who is himself guilty of double motive or insincerity.

The Commissioners reported in April; but it is remarkable that their Report did not so much as touch upon the subject of the three additional Bishoprics. It omitted it altogether, without a word of explanation, and was limited entirely to questions concerning Manchester and the Welsh sees. A Bill was thereupon brought into the House of Commons, was obstinately resisted at every stage of its progress, was read a third time, July 21, and the Order in Council for the appointment of the Bishop of Manchester was signed on August 10; but nothing was heard any more of the other Bishoprics.

On February 10, after the way had been most carefully prepared by securing the attendance and co-operation, as well of leading laymen, as of the clergy, a large meeting was held in Oxford for the formation of a Diocesan Society 'for building churches and parsonage houses,' and not merely for building new churches, but for rendering those already existing more serviceable. It was the Bishop's first great public appeal to his diocese since he had acquainted himself with its requirements, and he turned the occasion to account by the delivery of a long and elaborate address dealing both with principles and details. As to existing churches he spoke largely of the way in which their religious usefulness was destroyed by the nature of the pews which encumbered them, and which, as he specially asserted, tended to drive the poor into Dissent; and he enforced his remarks by reading out a

long list of churches from which the poor were thus actually excluded. As to new churches, the county of Berks needed five at once, besides nineteen parsonage houses; while that of Bucks required seventeen new churches and no fewer than thirty-one parsonage houses; making a total of fifty parishes in the two counties unprovided with parsonages. Now that it is so entirely the exception to find a country parish unprovided with its parsonage, it is well to remind readers how very different things were within comparatively recent times, and how much of the 'non-residence' of its clergy, which in former days used to be made so great a ground of objection to the Church, was owing simply to the fact that there were no houses for them to reside in. It may here be repeated that when the Bishop resigned the See of Oxford two hundred and fifty churches had been restored and seventy new parsonages [2] built. Public meetings were also held at the chief towns throughout the diocese, at which he presided in person and reiterated the arguments used at Oxford.

Meantime the proposals of the Government as to education had been made known; and here it is only right to point out that the Bishop's confidence in Lord John Russell was certainly justified. The plan was honest towards all parties, and offered equal pecuniary aid on equal terms to all schools accepting the inspection of the Government; and under the Bishop's direction the Oxford Diocesan Board of Education immediately memorialised the Lord President of the Council, acknowledging the offer of assistance and inspection, while it requested the Rural Deans to recom-

[2] Large as this number is, it falls short of the reality for two reasons: 1st, it includes only those built with the aid of the Society mentioned in the text; 2ndly, after 1857 the Society restricted its grants to cases where the annual value of the Benefice fell short of 200*l*.

mend the Government scheme to the parochial clergy. Absolutely impartial as the Government plan was, it was received with violent opposition by the Dissenters, and public meetings were held throughout the country to denounce it. In the House of Commons Mr. Bright described it as an attempt on the part of the Government 'to put down the voluntary exertions of the people to educate themselves,' and laid down the broad rule that education should be left to voluntary exertions—forgetting that the fundamental principle of the measure was *not* to 'put down,' but to stimulate these very voluntary exertions, which without such stimulus had proved totally unequal to the task.

On May 17 the Government Bill for limiting the hours of factory labour came under discussion, and was keenly opposed by the votaries of political economy. The Bishop had carefully studied the subject alike in its practical, its economical, and its moral bearings; and his conclusion was that the genuine principles of political economy were in no way violated by it. Any attempt to regulate the wages of labour by legislative enactment would no doubt amount to such violation, but the Bill made no such attempt. It only condemned the creation of wealth by such labour as sacrificed the health and morals of a portion of the people. The folly of legislation is needless interference. The wisdom of legislation is to provide necessary interference. And in this instance the interference was necessary to protect those who could not protect themselves from being forced to labour to an extent which was dangerous to the interests of society. The Bishop did not confine himself to the moral question; but, having examined the facts and figures of the case, he demonstrated that even when looked at from the economical point of view there would be nothing lost

from the proposed reduction, while if a precedent for the 'interference' were wanted, he could cite that of the recent prohibition of women's labour in mines, which, when first proposed, was resisted as bitterly as the Ten Hours Bill.

The following is a portion of his speech on the occasion:—

It has been assumed in argument that if one-sixth of the labourer's work were taken off, one-sixth of his pay must also be deducted, and the noble and learned Lord (Clarendon) had said that the labouring men had been deluded into a contrary expectation. Now he (the Bishop of Oxford) had himself seen the delegates of the manufacturing districts upon this subject, and when he had made this objection to them, and asked them what answer they could give to it, they said, 'Why, that is the argument of Lord Brougham, but there is nothing in that.' The delegates said that they had gone very carefully into the subject and had come to the conclusion that wages would probably sink one-twelfth for this one-sixth abatement of work, and they were prepared to stand the loss, for they could not bear to see the young females of their families, who were to be future wives and the mothers of children, growing up with bodies wasted and minds injured by the grievous labour which was inflicted on them.

The noble lord had said that the whole gain of the manufacturer depended upon the last two hours of labour which this measure proposed to abolish. That assertion was not altogether new. It came originally from one whose mind was tyrannised over by the speculations of political economy; but the assertion was totally and absolutely untrue. Did their Lordships really believe that the magnificent fortunes which had been amassed by manufacturers had been made by this nice fraction of the labourers' time alone? Let their Lordships remember what these two hours were—spent, as they were, in a room, which the noble earl had said was so comfortably warm. Comfortably warm! Their Lordships would remember that they were now talking of females and young persons, for it was only incidentally that the Bill touched any

one else. Let it not be forgotten that it was still a matter of dispute whether it was twelve or eighteen or twenty-seven miles a day which these females and young children walked in that comfortable warm atmosphere. Let it not be forgotten, either, that this work, which the noble earl described as easy, must be performed with the utmost fixedness of attention; wheels were on every side; danger was in every turn; a single instant of inattention might be followed by a loss of limb or of life. He believed that these last two hours were hours in which very little profit was made. He believed that in these last two hours accidents were multiplied, and that the work done was infinitely inferior in quality to that done in other hours. When exhausted nature failed to give that quickness of eye and rapidity of movement which were necessary to keep pace with the machinery, the work then done became a sort of drawback to the work done in the other part of the day. He found that those masters who knew their own interests—such as Messrs. Marshall—had reduced their hours of labour to eleven hours a day, and many other firms had followed their example. He held in his hand a remarkable return from one firm. The return was a statement of work done in five weeks preceding a diminution in the hours of labour and the five weeks following it, and it was found that the master's profit from working ten hours had slightly exceeded that from working twelve hours.

On this occasion the Bishop had the satisfaction of seeing his cause prosper, and the Bill passed its second reading in the House of Lords by a majority of 53 to 11. And the factory workmen were neither ungrateful nor forgetful. Years afterwards, when, in 1858, he visited Bradford to take part in the great meeting for the Propagation Society, of which more will be said in the proper place, he was greeted with an address[3] which

[3] The address was as follows :—

'To the Right Reverend Samuel, Lord Bishop of Oxford, Chancellor of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, and Lord High Almoner of Great Britain.

'My Lord,—We, the members of the Central Short Time Committee of the West Riding of Yorkshire, representing the Factory Operatives of these districts, cannot allow your Lordship to visit this town, the scene of our central operations,

showed how deep and lasting an impression his course on this occasion had left upon their minds.

The remainder of the Session and of the summer was somewhat barren of public or political incident,

without conveying to you the deep sense of gratitude we continue to feel for your devoted and powerful advocacy in the House of Lords eleven years ago of the claims of our youthful factory workers to legislative protection from excessive toil.

'Connected as you are, my Lord, by domestic ties and family recollections with this county, we are thankful to know that the all-engrossing cares and duties of your Episcopate in a different and distant part of the kingdom did not prevent you from lifting up your voice on behalf of ourselves and our little ones; and the courtesy and patience with which your Lordship received and listened to our chosen delegates, who waited upon you during that eventful struggle, followed by your forcibly eloquent and never-to-be-forgotten appeal in the Upper House of Parliament, assured us that the anxieties of a mitre had not consumed your affection for Yorkshire, and that as your revered and honoured father's name was for ever bound up inseparably with Britain's redress to the helpless negro, so you had resolved that the name of Wilberforce shall not be the least conspicuous among that noble band who laboured through evil report and good report for the emancipation of our factory children.

'Your Lordship will, we are sure, be gratified to hear that the results accruing from that important measure have been of the happiest and most beneficial kind to a large portion of the labouring population of the community, and can scarcely be over-estimated. To it may be mainly attributed the physical, social, intellectual, and religious improvement of our manufacturing operatives, and your Lordship will no doubt be glad to learn that there has grown up in this district especially a better understanding between the employers and the employed, and that where this enactment has been honestly and judiciously administered, it has ever met with a growing willingness on the part of the employers, as well as the operatives, to comply with its provisions.

'Your Lordship as a patriot, firmly attached to your country, and as a man possessing keen sensibilities for the welfare of your fellows, will not listen to these assurances without unmixed feelings of pleasure and satisfaction. You will rejoice that you bore a part in obtaining that great boon to our manufacturing population "THE TEN HOURS FACTORY ACT," for which we, on behalf of ourselves and others, beg most respectfully to tender to your Lordship our most grateful acknowledgments.

'Your Lordship, we are convinced, will never look back but with deep thankfulness to God that He put it into your heart to lend a helping hand to our cause. We shall continue to hope that He will bless you in the employment of those rare and noble gifts with which He has so richly endowed you, and that you may obtain the reward which is stored up for those who minister to their Lord through the helpless and the poor, and manifest their love to Him through the outcast and oppressed, His own consecrated representatives. Signed on behalf of the Central Short Time Committee of the West Riding of Yorkshire,

'JOHN RAWSON, *Chairman.* 'MATTHEW BALME, *Secretary.*

'St. George's Hall, Bradford, October 22, 1858.'

so far as the Bishop was concerned; but it was busy enough in other ways. Confirmations were occupying him largely, and from the first they were, what they always remained, occasions when he exerted most fully and most successfully all his powers of solemn persuasiveness. No description can convey any adequate conception of the vivid impressiveness, not merely of the addresses which he delivered to the candidates, but of the whole rite of Confirmation as he administered it. His own sense of the importance of the occasion was unusually deep. Sympathy with the young was a marked feature in his character, and he felt intensely the possibilities for good which were before the young people presented to him. Then, next, it was one of Bishop Wilberforce's peculiar gifts that when he did thus realise anything very deeply, his whole bearing, voice and gesture, eye and countenance, were, if such an expression may be permitted, transfigured by the thought or feeling which possessed him; so that the living man as he stood before you was, almost without words, the expression of that feeling. When, in addition to all this, his power of language is remembered, the energy and deep feeling which was apparent in every sentence and every tone, together with his charm of voice and special fertility and variety of phrase, no one will be surprised at the prodigious impression which his Confirmations always made alike upon the young and upon the old. The addresses were not prepared; or perhaps it would be more correct to say they were not written, at least not after the first few years of his episcopate. The preparation was rather of himself than of that which he was about to utter, and was usually that which preceded many of his most effective sermons—namely, a few minutes of very deep attention, concentrated upon one or two master thoughts.

Then, with these thoughts in full possession of his mind, the fitting word-vesture seemed to follow as matter of course: words and sentences flowing on and on, and adapting themselves to the specialities of the audience and the locality, as the curves of a river follow the contour of the country through which it passes, so that whether it was some rustic hamlet whose children were before him, or the town-bred boys of Oxford or of Reading, or the sons of the most cultured classes of the community, as at Eton or at Radley, the result was uniformly the same, the impression equally great, and in many, very many, cases most enduring. Of his own deep interest there could be no doubt. The present writer can never forget the pathos with which in private conversation the Bishop spoke of a poor private soldier wounded to death in the Crimea, whose dying words told of the altered life which he had led since his Confirmation in a village church in Oxfordshire, of the abiding memory of the Bishop's words, and of their value to him in the hour of death. It touched the Bishop deeply, and he often referred to it in his Confirmation addresses. Their variety, too, was remarkable; and one who frequently attended him on his Confirmation tours used to say that the Bishop never repeated himself, but that the freshness and originality of the last of the series were as striking as those of the first. The Confirmation of February 19, 1847, at Eton College Chapel, was long remembered and spoken of. Every available place in the chapel was filled with strangers. All the members of the College, to the number of nine hundred, were present. One hundred and ninety were confirmed; and the touching reference by the Bishop to a recent death among the pupils—that of Sir J. Cotterell—was felt universally.

At Aylesbury, too, on March 9, his manner was equally happy. Such things have been common enough since, so that the mere *act* may now seem hardly worth recording; but it did not seem so to those then present, who have told how at the close of an address which moved numbers to tears, all were impressed by the unexpected call of the Bishop to kneel in silent intercession for those about to be confirmed for a few moments before the actual laying on of hands. Not that everything went always smoothly, or that there were no objections made to what he said or did, however good and useful. Cavils and objections there were, and they pained him deeply; and his private letters contain many a short sharp phrase, revealing much of his inner feeling. On this very matter of the Confirmations above referred to, a letter written early in 1847 to a friend, enclosing one from a recalcitrant clergyman, has the following remarks:—

I send you a specimen of one of my diocesan troubles. Tell me if you like seeing such letters of pain as *that*.[4] What he alludes to about the Confirmn was this. At the laying on of my hands I ask all the clergy to kneel down and join in intercession. *He* stood up and talked to the clergyman next to him. Once or twice I stopped and looked at him, but in vain. I then sent the apparitor to desire him to speak to me. He came, and I told him that I would beg him to remain near me, as then he would not be tempted to talk. Poor man! He is quite, I fear, hardened in ungodliness and utter neglect of his parish; and a very clever, energetic man too.

Among his more noticeable engagements and public appearances of this period, was the great meeting of the friends of the Colonial Church, at the Hanover Square Rooms, Lord Eldon in the chair, on the 30th of June, being the day following the consecration in

[4] The letter mentioned above as enclosed.

Westminster Abbey of the four Colonial Bishops —Gray of Capetown, Tyrrell of Newcastle, Short of Adelaide, and Perry of Melbourne. Mr. Gladstone and the Bishop were the chief speakers on this occasion. In the same month, the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science was held at Oxford, when the Bishop preached the sermon, which, if it were not his really greatest sermon, was certainly that which attracted the largest amount of admiration. In the beginning of July he was present throughout the brilliant festivities which accompanied the installation of Prince Albert as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, a position to which the Prince had been elected in February, after a most severe contest[5] against the Earl of Powis, whose long and successful efforts for the preservation of the North Welsh See had excited the strongest feeling in his favour. Here also he preached at the University Church, and took occasion from the recent legislation respecting education to advocate the due training of the teachers of our National Schools—a subject which was then beginning to attract a larger share of public attention than before. Two church consecrations of special interest may also be mentioned, although outside of his own diocese. Of these one, which took place in the month of August, was that of the new church at Fasque, in the Diocese of Aberdeen, which had been built and endowed by Sir John Gladstone, the father of the Bishop's life-long friend, Mr. W. E. Gladstone. The other, a few months earlier, was that of a new church at Woolsthorpe, near Belvoir, just built by the Duke of Rutland, which gave occasion to the sub-joined letter descriptive of the castle, the host, and some of the guests at Belvoir. The reader may be

[5] The numbers were—for Prince Albert, 953; for the Earl of Powis, 837.

reminded that Mr. Disraeli's 'Coningsby' was then comparatively a new book, and that in it Lord John Manners was represented under a thinly-veiled pseudonym:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Belvoir Castle, March 4, 1847.

My dearest Sister,—I must do as you wish and write a few lines to you from Belvoir Castle. A most pleasant task it would be if time went with inclination. I got here yesterday about 5, lighting at the railroad station on Wm. Gladstone and Mrs. Gladstone, Sidney Herbert and his very nice new wife, Lord Clive, &c. &c. Belvoir Castle is a noble thing. It is quite Windsor Castle on a smaller scale, but more beautiful in situation. The views from the windows are noble, and all is *really* ducal. It is curious to contrast it with Stowe, where I was last week: here Nature has done all it could as well as Art: there Nature has given Art no aid. There is far *more* magnificence here and *less* display. Everything is really princely, the band, the Belvoir uniform, the picture-gallery.

The Duke is a very charming, thin, tall, perfectly gentlemanlike old man, living in the midst of his family, beloved by them and loving them; using all his influence for good, and, with his good sons, having quite raised the character of the clergy throughout the Vale of Belvoir. Lady Adeliza, to whom the Duke presented me as 'the Lady of the Castle,' is a very high-bred, pleasing lady, with much grace and kindness. Lord John really seems quite what Coningsby paints him, and I hope and believe a great deal more than poor Disraeli could easily paint. We had a pleasant even[g] last night. I sat, at dinner, next to Sidney Herbert. He is full of life and cleverness, and as agreeable as possible. She is a very pleasing, lively, spirited person, with a great deal of pathos, very pretty and pleasing, and, I think, really good.

This morning at 11 we were at the new church which the Duke has built. The Bishop of Lincoln preached, and I, with him, administered the Communion after the Consecration. Then we went for ¼ of an hour to the Castle and came back

to afternoon service, and at that I preached. The church was crowded morn[g] and afternoon, and about 60 clergymen there.

How often have I been earnestly beseeching for my boy, for dear Henry and Mary, and for you to-day. How do our Church prayers form themselves out thus into the most definite petitions for our dear ones troubled in mind, body, or estate. It is curious that at the time of his accident[6] I was so possessed with the depressing consciousness of some evil befalling him, that at last, on the third day after, the 13th, I wrote down that I was quite unable to shake off the impression that something had happened to him, and noted this down for remembrance.

I have been *greatly* interested by 'From Oxford to Rome, by a Fellow-traveller, and how it fared with some of them by the way.' It purports to be written by one who has gone over thirsting for more of the life of Godliness and is utterly disappointed; yet deems it impossible to return. It is deeply interesting. I should *very* much like to know whether it is a *real* voice from one who has so gone over. It would greatly interest you. I thought of Lady Georgina Fullerton as the possible author. . . .

I am ever your own brother in true affection,

S. OXON.

The next letter, begun at the Master's Lodge, Magdalen College, Cambridge, and finished after returning to London, refers to the installation of Prince Albert as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Magdalen Lodge, July 5, 1847.

My dearest Sister,—Many have been my thoughts of you and your quiet (too quiet, alas!) room during these busy days

[6] This refers to an accident which had happened to his eldest son Herbert, then at sea. At the moment when it took place the Bishop was in his Library at Cuddesdon with three or four of his clergy writing with him at the same table. He suddenly raised his hand to his head and exclaimed, 'I am certain that something has happened to one of my sons.' It afterwards transpired that just at that time his son's foot was badly crushed by an accident on board his ship.

of enforced silence; and very, very much I should have liked to steal out of the busy circle into it, and to be talking with you. I am now writing to you on Monday morning before breakfast, in order not to be prevented speaking to you by this post at least.

On Saturday I came down here, where I am most kindly received by the Dean of Windsor, also Master of this College. I was 3 times at sermons yesterday, and occupied all the rest of the day writing my sermon for the evening. The congregation was immense; afterwards I walked home outside the town with Mr. Carus, and meant to write to you at night: but was so entirely tired out that I gave it up.

Now, to-day at *one* the Queen is to arrive, and then come Senate-houses, and Installation Odes, and receptions, and levees, and for me receiving an *ad eundem* D.D. degree here, being admitted to 'the same station, step, and dignity here at Cambridge as you enjoy at home among your own Oxonians.' [Then continued and completed after returning to London.] The Cambridge scene was very interesting. There was such a burst of loyalty, and it told so on the Queen and the Prince. C. would not there have thought that he looked cold. It was quite clear that they both felt it as something new that *he* had *earned*, and not she given, a true English honour; and so he looked so pleased and she so triumphant. There were also some such pretty interludes,—when he presented the Address, and she beamed upon him and once half smiled, and then covered the smile with a gentle dignity, and then she said in her clear musical voice, 'The choice which the University has made of its Chancellor has my most entire approbation.'

I got back to London on Wednesday eve^g^, coming up in a state carriage with Bunsen, Sir R. and Lady Peel, and Count Waldemar. Count Waldemar is a fine manly intelligent 'brave' in look and manner. I had a good deal of conversation with him. Also I had a very curious observation of Sir R. Peel. He was reading the 'Quarterly,' and soon settled into Croker's bitter attack upon him, peeping into its uncut leaves with intense interest, and yet not liking to show that interest by cutting; and so, when Madame Bunsen, who saw nothing

of what was going on, offered a paper-cutter, courteously declining it and lapsing into an article on Pantagruelism, to fall again into the old article and peep again into the uncut leaves as soon as all was quiet.

Much has been already shown of the strength of the Bishop's feelings, as evidenced in his constant memory of his wife, and in the tone of his numerous letters to their early friend, Miss L. Noel. The following letter will show how keenly he could feel for one not united to him by the ties of kinship or of early association. The opening of the letter refers to a serious illness of the Rev. R. C. Trench, here again[7] familiarly designated as 'Justin':—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

61, Eaton Place, May 2, 1847.

Dearest Sister,—I must send you a few lines this evening. You will have seen from yesterday's letters that Justin is ill of the Irish typhus fever. He had been *here* on Monday, but I was out and he had seen Mrs. Sargent. She said he looked dreadfully ill; but it was the remains of his illness in Ireland, and after giving a lecture at King's Coll. he was to go down to Itchenstoke. I supposed he was gone, until Friday night, when I heard that he was ill of this fever at Maurice's, and wished to see me. I went yesterday. He looks *very* ill, and has that most anxious *fever* look which is so distressing. The physician says he feels no doubt, humanly speaking, of his recovery, but that he fears it will be a long illness. I have been this afternoon (after preaching in the morning at Trinity Church) to Lincoln's Inn to hear Maurice and see him. All last night, whenever he dozed off, he began to wander in mind, thinking he was in an insurrection against the Government, &c. &c. I am fearful for him, and yet I trust he will be given to our prayers. To *me* his loss would be irreparable. May God of His great mercy spare us this blow.

I dined the other day in company with Carlyle. He was

[7] See foot-note to page 310.

very great. Monckton Milnes drew him out. Milnes began the young man's cant of the present day of the barbarity and wickedness of capital punishment, that after all we could not be sure others were wicked, &c. Carlyle broke out on him with 'None of your Heaven and Hell amalgamation companies for me. We *do* know what is wickedness. *I* know wicked men: men whom I *would not live with:* men whom under some conceivable circumstances I would kill or they should kill me. No, Milnes, there's no truth or greatness in all that. It's just poor miserable littleness. There was far more greatness in the way of your old German fathers who, when they found one of those wicked men, dragged him to a peat bog, and thrust him in and said, "*There*, go in *there*. There is the place for all such as thee."'

On the 21st of April, occurred the death of the Bishop's mother. It took place at the house of her youngest son, Henry, the Vicar of East Farleigh; and there, in East Farleigh churchyard, she was buried, having survived the decease of her husband, the great philanthropist, for nearly fourteen years. Respecting Bishop Wilberforce's mother little can now be recovered. Letters, however, from her to her son show that she must have been a person of much observation, and of considerable vigour of expression and tenacity of purpose. One phrase occurs in a letter written by Mr. Charles Anderson to his friend S. Wilberforce, in 1831, which shows that the son's remarkable power of attending to many things at once had also characterised his mother. It is as follows: 'I know you have the faculty of your good mother of writing, talking, and listening all at once.' In later years the Bishop has been known to dictate seven letters simultaneously. Of his mother's character, and of her departure, the Bishop thus wrote, adding a few characteristic words respecting his late diocesan, the Bishop of Winchester:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

61, Eaton Place, April 29, 1847.

My dearest Sister,—Robert and I went down to East Farleigh on Saturday. We all spent the Sunday together, and on Monday laid all that was mortal of our dearest mother in Robert's vault. There lay the coffin of Agnes looking quite fresh and new; and thereby was the coffin of Jane's sister, who died at E. Farleigh. There was something affecting, greatly, in thus parting with the last of the past generation, though the last weeks of suffering and wandering had made me feel it *indeed* as a release when her troubled spirit passed from this world of unrest to that world of rest. Dear creature! Never was there a tenderer or more loving mother; rarely one more sensible or more really able; and her humility was indeed deep. I had longed to see her once at Cuddesdon, knowing that she would greatly have enjoyed seeing me there; but God has ruled it otherwise and better.

I went down yesterday with the B^p^ of Winton to Sunningdale to lay the first stone of a new parsonage for Fosbery, and to preach thereon. This I did on the last two verses of the Acts of the Apostles, and have, in consequence, hardly any voice left to-day, being as hoarse as it is possible to be. It is very interesting to me going about with my old Bishop, and he was all kindness and entered gravely and earnestly into matters. Oh, how little justice does that bantering manner he sometimes puts on do to what I am sure is really in him. Yet there is an exquisite propriety about him in all his conduct.

And later on in the year there is the letter previously referred to, touching on his feelings when engaged in Confirmations:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Speen, Oct. 12, 1847.

My dearest Sister,—I got up this morning before six, that I might have time to write at least a few lines to you; but I

began with pressing business letters, and after getting through 22, and actually having my paper out to begin with a quiet mind, I was called by the Archdeacon to prayers; instantly after breakfast I was in the carriage; then 2 long Confirmations, both full of interest, with an intervening seven miles, took the time till just before dinner. . . . There is so much of deep interest in a Confirmation, that it takes a great deal out of one. The *present* interest is intense: the single opportunity of making, if God will, a dint in a character; the gathering in, if they have been watched over and prayed for, the fruit of past weeks; the raising them to something quite new, if they have been neglected; then all the old interest of Brighstone and Alverstoke wakes up. I remember the deep anxiety with which I presented one and another, the fear, the doubt, the trembling hope, the joy with which I saw one and another come forward, and the after fulfilment or disappointment; and then our Bishop's visits were so hailed by *her*, and she was so beautiful as the reserve which had always gathered melted under his coming and his kindness. Oh! dearest sister, what a maze and mixture is our life! Then I see you with us, we three after he was gone talking about it.

Besides, too, all this present interest, there is so much insight in all this into the state of parishes and character of clergy, so many heavy thoughts and desponding views of what can be done by such and such a man bearing the Prophet's office, and then such bright gleams when a dull, heavy-mannered, shut-up man opens, in his parish, into conscientious, loving labour. I have not said a word about the Wasing Confirmation. It most deeply touched me; and when I saw the dear ——'s grey hairs before me, I felt as if all was reversed and the greater was blessed of the less. But so it is in the Church, that no man may be elated by Self creeping into acts of Office.

I am so glad that you did see C. Winton, and that you will again quite feel with me in my true affection for him. In the afternoon I was at Mr. H——'s church. *She* is sister to the former Mrs. B——of Woking, and very like her—a gentle, holy lady, one of those morally—and, from delicacy and good-

ness of appearance, physically—beautiful faces, which always remind me of E——.

Ever believe me to be, my dearest sister,

Your own brother,

S. OXON.

Parochial squabbles have justly become a by-word; and almost a synonym for all that is vexatious and wearisome. To some extent the same thing has to be said respecting the infinite number of minor troubles which lie beneath the surface of diocesan administration; and yet it is on the due handling of such difficulties that a large part of the real usefulness and success of a Bishop's work must depend. It has been already stated, that before Bishop Wilberforce had been three months in his diocese his letter-book positively teems with letters to clergy touching the state of their parishes, their Church services, and other similar details. As time went on, he became increasingly beset with calls for interference, or with complaints which required attention. Such matters occur everywhere, and must in the main be passed over in such a biography as this. But the portrait of Samuel Wilberforce as a diocesan Bishop would be altogether imperfect, and therefore in its measure untrue, if it included no specimen of his mode of dealing with cases of this description. He was specially remarkable for his readiness to make the attempt to compose differences and to reconcile opponents. Most men shrink from such interventions, and only enter on them when absolutely unavoidable. They judge, and for the most part rightly, that the probable issue will only be to concentrate the hostility of both the disputants upon him who interposes, and count the risk of failure greater than the chance of success. Bishop Wilberforce seems never to have been restrained by

such a feeling, but in all cases to have gone forward with what he regarded as his duty, without calculating either the disappointment or the annoyance which he might encounter. In the vast majority of cases it is well known that mildness and gentleness characterised his mode of action. There were others which, if taken up at all, must be dealt with by stronger methods. Bishop Wilberforce could use strong measures as well as mild ones; he could reprove as well as exhort; and the following example must be taken as a specimen of the way in which he addressed himself to the difficult but most necessary work of the healer of dissensions :—

In the course of 1847 a young rector of High Church opinions was aggrieved by the needlessly aggressive manner in which a senior clergyman in his neighbourhood, but of opposite opinions, put forward his views. Neither of them was conciliatory, and each was naturally of a disposition to push matters to extremities. It ended in the younger laying before the Bishop certain propositions concerning Baptism which his opponent had affirmed in a declaration circulated in the neighbourhood, and calling upon the Bishop to declare, first, whether or not they were heretical; and, next, whether such propositions could lawfully be maintained by a clergyman of the Church of England.

The Bishop naturally tried to pour oil upon the waters; he did not defend either the conduct or the opinions complained of, but *inter alia* he pointed out to the complainant that unless the person complained of either categorically denied the doctrines of the Church, or rejected her formularies, he *could* not be punished for his opinions; nor did he (the Bishop) desire to see 'such men cast out, believing that many of them, with all their errors of opinion, were in the main matter sound, and amongst the most devout

men we had.' Further letters followed; among other things the writer took exception to the Bishop's use of the word 'opinion,' and inquired if the Bishop really meant to relegate the doctrine of Baptism to the category of 'opinion,' upon which the Bishop's final letter was as follows:—

The Bishop of Oxford to the Rev. —— ——.

Rev. Sir,—You entirely misapprehend my feelings when you speak of your letters having 'given me needless offence.' They gave me no offence at all. Their tone of self-assumption, of which you are so unconscious, pained me deeply as one set to watch over your soul and longing to see in you one in whose ministry I might rejoice.

That pain is not removed by your last, for, alas! it breathes just the same spirit. You profess to gather that certain great doctrines of the Gospel may with 'perfect impunity be denied in this diocese.' Your inference is as utterly unfounded as your language is unbecoming. You do not know what may have passed between me and Mr. ——.[8] The mode and spirit of your complaint make it impossible to speak to you on that head. The only inference you ought to draw is this, that a presbyter in this diocese who assumes to himself the office of judging his brother, and proceeds publickly to anathematize him uncondemned, will draw down upon himself my grave rebuke.

You talk of 'defending the Catholic faith against me and of resisting me as a layman might the first Bishop of the Church;' and you speak of my treating great truths as 'opinions.' But all this is only unfounded and indecent imputation. The Church has defined these doctrines in her Liturgy and Articles. These definitions are to us the test of soundness, and against those who have subscribed them with a solemn declaration that they do so sincerely and *ex animo* I do not think that proceedings can be taken. But to say this is not to treat the doctrines as opinions.

[8] The letter which the Bishop had written to the clergyman whose conduct and teaching were complained of will be given next.

Why do I thus, as it were, exculpate myself to you? Surely this is scarcely, even in your estimate of yourself, the fitting relative position for a Bishop and one of the youngest of his presbyters. But I do it, not to justify myself—for it is, I assure you, ἐλάχιστον in my eyes whether you justify or whether you condemn me;—but I do it if perchance I may, through God's grace, win you to see something of that judging, self-assuming spirit which is so strong within you, and which must, if it be not cast out, mar your ministry if it does not slay your soul.

The letter to the clergyman complained of ran thus:—

The Bishop of Oxford to the Rev. —— ——.

Rev. and dear Sir,—I have to address you on a painful matter, to which I must ask your most serious attention. One of your brother clergy, the Rev. ——, has written to me to complain that great scandal is caused in your whole neighbourhood and great injury done in his parish by the avowed subscription by you of a declaration by which the Articles and Liturgy of the Church of England are depraved.

The first part of this declaration is this:—'Ungodly persons have neither been born again of the Spirit nor justified, although they were baptized in infancy,' &c. Now this declaration is directly at variance with the words both of the Liturgy and the Articles, both of which affirm (the Catechism) that, being by nature children of wrath, we were *thereby* made children of grace; and, as the answer next but one continues, this was done for them (*sic*) through God's goodness on the promise of a future condition by their sponsors. The Baptismal Service takes the same ground, throwing the affirmation into the strongest form by instructing *every* minister to say of every baptized infant to the jealous God (after the public announcement, 'Seeing now that this child is [regenerate] born again'), 'We give THEE hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate *this* child with Thy Holy Spirit,' &c.; and it follows up all this with saying: 'It is certain by God's Word that children *which are baptized*,

dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.' But how saved unless they be pardoned; or how then saved unless by God's merciful act they be regenerated by His Spirit; or, as good old Baxter says, unless we be Pelagians?

Now the question for us at this moment is not, Are these doctrines true, but, Are they the doctrines of the Church of England? If they are, you cannot as an honest man eat the bread offered for her ministers and teach otherwise. It is the more needful that I should speak to you here with all plainness, because I have pointed out, and God helping me I shall point out, to those in danger of the opposite errors of the Church of Rome, that *as honest men* they cannot minister in the Church of England holding the doctrines of the Church of Rome; and I must be fair and even-handed, lest haply by me the truth of Christ be put in peril.

Now, this language of yours is as really the language of Puritan separatists as is the formal statement of the doctrine of Transubstantiation the language of Popish separatists from us. The Puritans denied that there was in the two Sacraments any special grace conveyed beyond that which by faithful men was always attained by prayer and hearing the Word. The Church of England affirmed that they were not only signs or seals, but also *instruments*, which God so used that with the outward elements was surely given, to the right receiver, the inward Grace. Now, the Puritan might be right, or the Church might be right, but both cannot; and your subscription is a pledge that as a teacher you will simply and earnestly teach as *She* teaches and not as the *Puritans* teach. I am bound therefore to tell you that *I*, as a conscientious man, could not hold a commission to teach on the terms you hold your's, and teach as this declaration teaches. Let me then call, as in God's sight, your most earnest attention to the question. If *your* view of truth is *not* the view of the Church of England formularies you have subscribed, you cannot, without an implied falsehood, which must put your soul in peril, bear the commission of a teacher in her communion.

Of course, I am well aware you may say, 'Others do so;' but, my dear sir, will such a plea hold before the judgment seat of Christ?

Again, I am aware that there are many shades of opinion on this question, and I have not the least wish to set up mine as a law. So far from it I believe that the Church, following herein the mind of Christ, meant to leave a large license of diverse opinion open even to her ministers on *each side;* and I would never narrow this license, *e.g.* many only mean to deny, in their language against Baptismal Regeneration, such errors as these: first, that the work of Grace is accomplished in Baptism; or, that souls are converted in Baptism, or need no conversion to God *afterwards;* or that if baptized and afterwards of decent life, they need no deeper heart change; or that they have a robe of pardon and a stock of grace then given them which they are afterwards to strive to keep clean, and use, and that these gifts if lost cannot be renewed. Now, it is right to protest against these great errors, and the only fault, therefore, of those who, meaning to protest against *them*, do protest against 'Baptismal Regeneration,' is, that they confound together an error which their Church condemns and a truth their Church teaches. This I cannot but hope, and nothing deeper, is your error in having subscribed this declaration; and I trust that now that I have been called upon to bring the matter formally before you, you will so explain your subscription to it, and, if it be possible, withdraw it, as to give relief to the minds of many of your brethren in the ministry, who are, I am assured, greatly scandalized by your *apparently* signing the Articles and Liturgy in a non-natural, that is, in a dishonest sense.

It has cost me much pain thus to address you, but a sense of duty compels me to it. I cannot effectually guard the purity of the faith, in that portion of the Church committed to me, from dishonesty of subscription on the side of Romanizers, if I wink at a like sin on the side of Puritanizers.

Assuring you of my prayers to God for you, I am, Rev. and dear Sir, your faithful friend and brother,

S. OXON.

And here is a letter of reproof to an incumbent who was complained of by his Rural Dean for fraternising with Dissenters:—

The Bishop of Oxford to the Rev. —— ——.

(*Private.*)

61, Eaton Place, May 5, 1848.

Rev. and dear Sir,—I am very sorry that you cannot contradict the report concerning which I questioned you, and I am sorry for the tone of your reply, as well as its substance. There was nothing in my enquiry which needed any reference to the 'rights of man' or of 'an Englishman.' I had no thoughts of any legal question, or legal penalties, when I wrote to you. But there are many things which are highly inexpedient, which yet cannot be punished by law, and I feel it my painful duty to say to you, with all distinctness, that I esteem your conduct in this instance to be one of these.

If there is no difference between us and Dissenters, what can our Ordinal and all our Reformed Liturgy mean? How can we justify in God's sight continuing in a body, which by refusing to acknowledge their ministry is guilty of the highest breach of charity, if there is no sufficient reason for maintaining separation? Either we Churchmen have ground from God's Word for being thus distinctively Churchmen, or we are the most miserable schismatics. If we *have* ground for such separation, there must be, in a clergyman's taking part (as I have, since I wrote, seen that you did) in a meeting held in the *Meeting-house*, for such a purpose as that for which this was called, and *under the superintendence* of one who has himself renounced the ministry of our Church and 'caused division,' the most painful inconsistency. It is one thing to have the largest charity towards separatists, another to receive the endowments attached to the office of a teacher in a Church which condemns their separation, and yet to join them as closely as can be done with legal impunity in the acts of their separation.

I have felt it my duty, my dear Sir, to express to you my opinion on this matter, and (with no idea of doing anything further than thus sending you, in a friendly spirit, my judgment on the case, to which I am sure you will give the weight which is due to my office) to entreat you to abstain from a line of action which grieves the hearts of your brethren in the

ministry, which weakens their hands, which I am confident will injure your ministry, in the full prosperity of which it is my heart's desire to rejoice with you, and which is gravely and entirely condemned by him who, however unworthy, is set over you in the Lord, and to whom, therefore, in matters of doubtful obligation, I know you would desire, for Christ's sake, to defer. I remain, Rev. and dear Sir, very sincerely your's,

S. OXON.

On the other hand, here is a letter to one who had been one of Mr. Newman's most ardent followers, and who, having been nominated to the charge of a parish, had written to the Bishop, in doubt whether, considering his connection with Mr. Newman, the Bishop would approve of his undertaking the cure :—

The Bishop of Oxford to the Rev. —— ——.

Cuddesdon, Nov. 5 [1847].

Rev. and dear Sir,—I have read your letter with the deepest and most painful interest; not that its picture of —— is darker than my own fears had painted it, but that I see it as I had feared it to be, and as I have often groaned over it. Yet what is there in its state which may not be accounted for by its past history? or which the power of Christ's presence cannot heal? This work I beseech you to undertake. I will not hide from you that I suppose there may be differences of view between us involving important questions. But there is and must be fundamental agreement, and there may be, I trust, hearty confidence and co-operation as the fruit of perfect openness. My own principle is this :— The Church of England gives, as I believe, within certain limits, by which she has marked off for her children Popery on the one side and Puritanism on the other, a large license of opinion and of action to her sons. That license I do not wish to narrow ; I do not wish to dogmatize within the wide circle of her formularies. All who can honestly subscribe *them* seem to me to have as much right to their views as I have to mine. If, therefore, they can do this, whether they

go beyond me on one side or the other, I can heartily and trustfully work with them. *I* must openly and fully state and act on my own views of truth; I rejoice that they should do the same. I can alter nothing to please any man; but I can bear with a large diversity of judgment on open points; and I had far rather see working under me a true, earnest, self-denying, loving follower of my Lord, who, though he differed from me on many such points, yet did in his life and doctrine set before sinners the living power of y^e^ Cross of our only Saviour, than one with whom I far more agreed in dogma, but whose devotion and love and zeal and readiness to bear and do, were languid and poor.

For this reason I welcome you to ——, and beg you, for Christ's sake, to labour there amongst its debased population. I will always speak openly to you; I will ask you to trust me. I believe that you may do there, what few others could do; and I greatly trust that in blessing others there, you may yourself receive consolations and support, which I can well understand your wounded heart to need. I am, Rev. and dear Sir, your faithful friend and brother,

S. OXON.

Of the pains which Bishop Wilberforce was ready to take on behalf of any of his clergy who consulted him, two specimens must suffice. The first is a letter to an incumbent who sought his advice as to marrying Dissenters :—

The Bishop of Oxford to the Rev. —— ——.

61, Eaton Place, July 18, 1846.

My dear Sir,—I have waited before I replied to your letter of July 13, until I had taken some legal opinions upon the questions which it raises.

I have the opinions of D^r^ Lushington, D^r^ Phillimore, a Common Law Barrister, and the Bishop of London. They all agree, (1) that you are absolutely bound to publish the banns and perform the marriage of all persons qualified to demand the same by age and residence in your parish, *not being legally excommunicated by sentence of court;* (2) that

you may be compelled to do so by process of court; (3) punished, probably in the Common Law, and certainly in the Ecclesiastical Courts, for your refusal. I send you a copy of my answer to the complainant, from which you will see that I have fixed the case as narrowly as truth would permit, in order to shelter you from any attempted annoyance. But to you privately I must use a different language, and earnestly entreat you to reconsider the position you are assuming.

There is no doubt that our clergy, in this and in many other aspects, are in a most anomalous position. They are the ministers of the Catholic Church; and they are also ministers of a Church which *has been truly* a national church; and so they have succeeded to public national offices. Now, whilst the ties of the Presbyter of the Church to the people have been in so many instances relaxed or broken, the ties of the public officer to the population have continued. Hence arises *a legal obligation* to perform offices (seemingly) not due from the Church to the separatist.

BUT, *first*, the mode of remedying this evil must be by (*a*) altering the law, or (*b*) excommunicating the parties, not by our holding preferment by law, and then refusing to obey the law in virtue of which we retain our benefices; *secondly*, we ought to consider whether the breaking these remaining bonds is not wilfully giving up what God's providence has still left to us, whereby to win back these persons, or still more their children, to our spiritual charge. We never, I think, must forget that this practical separation from us is so greatly the fault of ourselves in our own predecessors, that we ought, as far as the limits of right will possibly allow, to strain every permissive power conceded to us by the Church to the very utmost, to retain *any* hold on those who will be so greatly injured by departing, and who can be retained only by a very large admixture of a gentle and loving forbearance with any attempt after revived discipline. Believe me, my dear Sir, most sincerely your's,

S. OXON.

The last example is of another kind. A young

clergyman, in Deacon's Orders, felt unable without further counsel to offer himself for Ordination as a Priest. He wrote to the Bishop fully as to the hindrances in his way, and the Bishop replied at length.

The Bishop of Oxford to the Rev. —— ——.

(*Private.*)

Cuddesdon Palace.

My dear Sir,— I have read and prayed over your letter. It has deeply affected me, and I earnestly desire, in reply to its trusting confidence, to say all that I can to you in the way of direction.

But in doing this I am met by this difficulty, that, even after your letter, I feel much at a loss to estimate accurately *the facts* on which my judgment must be founded. I must therefore reply in some measure hypothetically.

I. If you refer to any habits of actual Sin, *now* occasionally allowed, I do not think you would act rightly in seeking Priest's Orders.

II. But if you refer to *past Sins*, of which you can hope you have repented truly, the acts of which you do not now allow, the moral consequences of which to yourself you lament and resist, I do not see in them a reason for withholding Priest's Orders from you. *For*, if you have received from God the grace of penitence, if you are believing in Christ, your sins *are* forgiven you—they *are not*. The blood of Christ *cleanseth*, not *will* cleanse at the Judgment Day, but clean*seth* us from all sin.

Nor do I think that the remains within your moral nature of the bitter consequences of past sins, in doubts or fears, or again in temptations to coldness in devotion, ought to keep you from the service of your Saviour in this high office. The '*Go* tell my disciples *and Peter*,'—'to whom much is forgiven the same loveth much,'—'when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren,'—seem to me to settle this point. But this I say, always supposing that there is no present parleying with the evil; that it is the swell of an old storm, not the surging of a present storm, by which you are shaken.

This, then, would be my judgment upon the actual question, but there is yet another. Ought you to apply for this Ordination until you yourself can with a quiet mind seek for it?

Now this must be, in great measure, a question of *degree*. There is a *degree* of doubt and fear which, I think, would very seriously intercept the offering of yourself to God: and I do not say that I would advise you, in spite of *that* degree, to come without delay for Priest's Orders. Yet the evils of delay are manifold, not only from its bearing upon others, of which I need not speak, but from its bearing *on yourself*. The mind is so susceptible of morbid impressions that there is real danger lest the craving for delay should grow with the delay, and that which seemed to be a holy awe resolve itself into a hindrance of the enemy. You should therefore try every means to dispel these fears. Whether opening everything to your Father would tend to do this you can judge. If so it would be well for you to do so; but there is no other reason for your taking such a step. Or if you think that your fully opening out your mind to me will aid you, I, according to my office, shall gladly receive you, and hear and weigh all and counsel you to the best of my power. I would gladly receive you *here* on Friday if you like to come and stay till Saturday, or afterwards in London.

May God Almighty direct, comfort, and support you, and bring you safely through, is, my dear Sir, the hearty prayer of your's very faithfully,

S. OXON.

To this letter the applicant replied by another inquiry: (1), how long a probation the Bishop recommended prior to taking Priest's Orders; and (2), whether or not he would wish him, during the interval, to abstain from occasional ministrations, upon which the Bishop rejoined thus:—

The Same to the Same.

Rev. and dear Sir,—The answers to both your questions so entirely depend upon *details*, of which I am not in possession, that I cannot give you so exact a reply as I could wish.

But I may give you the principle by which to answer your own question.

Putting aside, then, the danger of possible scandal to the Church, the object of waiting for a certain time is to *test* the *reality* of repentance. Where this is the working of God's grace, it is shown by the *overcoming* of evil; in all other respects natural feelings, altered circumstances, and the like, may counterfeit the good work. Now the time needful to test the work will depend upon the greatness of the actual transgression, the inveteracy of the habit to be subdued, upon the degree to which the sin is of itself subject to lulls and pauses of active temptation, and in a great measure also upon the clear evidence to yourself, of the turning from the sin being a part of true turning of the whole heart to Christ in all things, and not a partial amendment. There are some cases of penitence which, like S[t] Peter's, seem to concentrate a life of repentance into an agony of contrition under the very eye of our dear Lord.

This same canon may, I think, answer your second question. Where there is no danger of scandal, you might safely assist another much sooner than you would seek Priest's Orders or undertake a cure; whenever, in a word, the proof of a victory over sin was, to your own conviction, strong enough to enable you to minister without the consciousness of insincerity. I am your's very faithfully,

S. OXON.

The general account thus far given of the period under consideration is all that can be framed from the existing materials. The Bishop's diaries, so carefully kept as they had been up to the beginning of his Episcopate, so complete as after the year 1852 they remain to the very latest day of his life, are almost a total blank for the interval between 1846 and 1853. It is only from his letters, and the various reminiscences furnished by those who knew him, and some (early) personal recollections on the part of the writer, that the story of his first years in his Episcopal office can be,

however inadequately, compiled. It must not, however, be omitted that this year, 1847, was that of the General Election which followed Lord John Russell's accession to power in 1846, and the year when Mr. Gladstone became member for the University of Oxford, as he remained until the General Election of 1865, when he was unseated by Mr. Gathorne Hardy, now Lord Cranbrook. It was also the year of the secession to the Church of Rome of Mr. Macmullen, who had been, though unofficially, much connected with the Church of St. Saviour, at Leeds—a circumstance which at the time contributed largely to keep alive the uneasiness resulting from the previous secession of Mr. J. H. Newman.

Looking back across the period which has now been traversed of the Bishop's life, it is impossible not to be struck with its almost unbroken character of brightness and success. Rapid as his promotion had been, various as had been the positions which he had filled, many as had been the aspects in which he had come before the Church and the public, it is not too much to say that everything to which he had put his hand had prospered. Setting aside the great sorrow of his life—his wife's comparatively early death—there had been absolutely nothing to cast a shadow upon his career. It would almost seem as if the charm of his manner and his address had created a circle round him impervious to those cross accidents and adverse incidents which usually beset any active man, and especially one who had been engaged in such a multitude of affairs as Samuel Wilberforce. So it had been, unquestionably, up to the close of his forty-second year, and the autumn of 1847; but so it was to be no longer. On the 5th of November of that year died Dr. Harcourt, Archbishop of York; and Dr. Musgrave, Bishop of Hereford, was

his successor, thus vacating the see of Hereford. In a few days more it became known that the Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, to whom Bishop Wilberforce had been disposed to look for measures advantageous to the Church, had recommended Dr. Hampden, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, to the vacant Bishopric, and with the controversy which ensued, the Bishop of Oxford encountered a storm of opposition and of obloquy to which he had hitherto been a stranger ;—a storm, too, of which the results, unhappily, were as lasting as its outbreak was sudden, and of which even now, after the lapse of upwards of thirty years, many of the circumstances remain matters of debate. It was, in fact, a marked epoch in his career, and it will be needful to devote to it a separate and a somewhat lengthy chapter. It remains only, before proceeding to this fresh subject, to refer once more to the death of the Archbishop of York, with whom Bishop Wilberforce had been on terms of intimate friendship ; and to add the following letter, in which occurs a vivid character-sketch of the deceased Primate—one of those rapid vigorous pictures of which, as this biography proceeds, many examples will recur :—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Lavington, Nov. 13, 1847.

Dearest Sister,—We have the most lovely morning here to-day for our first Lavington day. I got up and looked out at a little after 5. It was a stainless sky, Jupiter so large and bright, as to cast quite rays over the sleeping trees ; just the very faintest *white* light over the Eastern Hill sky, saying that HE would come for Whom we wait and make all new. I never look out on that early morn[g] hill-side without such thoughts of our dead. I remember just before Harry Sargent died, one night when I sat up with him, he asked me to show him the hill-side at the first dawn, and I opened all the

windows, and we gazed at it together. And now *she* is gone, too. I went early to her grave this morning, and prayed for our H. and E., and all the little ones, and you ; and the moss was so green, and the trees all bare, to say how bare a time it was, and the sky all bright, to say that there was light above, and the green moss said there was REST for them that sleep in Him. And then, when I come in to breakfast, came your note, like a token from the far land, and it quite overset me for a time.

The old Archbishop *had* greatly won upon my affections. There was a charming kindness and love about him, and simplicity and absence of selfishness. The *want* was depth—in every way ; in intellect, in moral purpose, in sense of responsibility, in concentration of affection. His face quite expressed it ; broad, large, yet fine features, nothing gross or low or Rubens-like, but broad and unconcentrated, a man of unbroken prosperity, whom nothing deeply wounded, from whom no crushing would bring out perfume ; yet loveable, very, from extreme kindliness, simplicity, unaffectedness ; chatty, discursive, easily pleased, easily, never deeply, interested ; a man to live with, not to die with, for sunshine, not for clouds and storm and dark, dark night ; yet quite very loveable. Does this do ? Can you love him ? If not, I have quite quite failed in painting him, because *you* could have loved him too. . . .

CHAPTER XI.

(Nov. 1847—Jan. 1848.)

THE HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY.

EXCITEMENT CAUSED BY NOMINATION OF DR. HAMPDEN TO BISHOPRIC OF HEREFORD—CHARACTERISTICS OF HIS BAMPTON LECTURES—HIS 'OBSERVATIONS ON RELIGIOUS DISSENT'—REVIEW OF PROCEEDINGS IN OXFORD IN 1836 AND 1842—REMONSTRANCE OF THE THIRTEEN BISHOPS—LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S REPLY—ADDRESSES FOR AND AGAINST DR. HAMPDEN—BISHOP OF OXFORD'S LETTER TO LORD JOHN RUSSELL AND LORD JOHN'S REPLY—BISHOP OF OXFORD'S CONNECTION WITH THE CASE THROUGH THE CHURCH DISCIPLINE ACT OF 1840—THE BISHOP GRANTS 'LETTERS OF REQUEST'—ATTEMPTS TO OBTAIN SATISFACTORY ANSWERS FROM DR. HAMPDEN ON CERTAIN POINTS—CORRESPONDENCE WITH LORD JOHN RUSSELL—DR. HAMPDEN'S REPLY—REMARKS ON THE BISHOP OF OXFORD'S LETTER TO DR. HAMPDEN—DR. HAMPDEN'S NOTE TO PROVOST HAWKINS MADE KNOWN TO THE BISHOP—WITHDRAWAL OF THE LETTERS OF REQUEST—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE BISHOP OF OXFORD AND THE PROVOST OF ORIEL—BISHOP OF OXFORD'S LETTER OF DEC. 28, 1847, TO DR. HAMPDEN—BISHOP OF EXETER'S LETTER OF JAN. 1, 1848, TO BISHOP OF OXFORD, WITH THE BISHOP OF OXFORD'S REPLY—LETTERS FROM BISHOP OF OXFORD TO ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE, TO MISS L. NOEL, TO PROFESSOR WALKER, AND TO REV. E. BICKERSTETH—LETTER FROM SIR R. PEEL—SUBSEQUENT PROCEEDINGS IN THE CASE—GENERAL REVIEW—LETTERS TO MISS L. NOEL.

On Monday, November 15, 1847, the *Times* newspaper announced that the Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, had recommended Dr. Hampden to Her Majesty for the Bishopric of Hereford vacated by the translation of Dr. Musgrave to the Archbishopric of York. The effect of this announcement was electrical, and the excitement which it produced throughout the country was instantaneous. Accustomed as we have become since that time to ecclesiastical contests, it requires some effort of imagination to realise the startled

surprise with which this action of the Prime Minister was received, and the tumult which ensued.[1] It was not only in ecclesiastical quarters that this surprise was felt. In a leading Article of the same day, the *Times*, at that time a steady supporter of the Government, wrote thus:—'We cannot imagine on what principle or motive it [the nomination of Dr. Hampden] has been adventured.' And then, after deprecating the uproar which it was sure to excite, the *Times* proceeds to say that, 'on the other hand, there is no party whatever, at least none worth taking into account, to whom the new appointment to the See of Hereford can possibly be agreeable. It is not a question between High and Low Church, or between the Church and Dissenters. Lord John Russell may depend upon it that in selecting Dr. Hampden he has committed a political blunder.'

Great, however, as was the disturbance, a comparatively brief notice of it would have sufficed for the purposes of this biography had not Bishop Wilberforce's personal share in it become ultimately matter of controversy almost as keen as that which arose about the appointment itself. For this reason, if for no other, it is necessary that the whole circumstances should be detailed with especial fulness. It will be needful not

[1] An example of outside opinion is to be found in the following extract from a letter signed 'Publicola' in the *Weekly Dispatch* of Dec. 19:—

'Dr. Hampden is a sound philosopher, but an unsound believer. He has more faith in the moral nature of man than in the three Creeds. His writings are in a wise and lofty spirit; but they are not in the spirit of the Catechism and Prayer-Book. It is vain to blink the fact that the man is a heretic; and the heretic is too much of a true man to be fit for a Church of England Bishop, if we take the Church of England itself for a standard. Here is the weak point of the appointment. The Church demands orthodoxy of all, and especially of its prelates. Technically, the reply is good, that Dr. Hampden has subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles. But what is it morally? Dr. Hampden would have been a greater man, had he kicked the mitre with his foot instead of bowing his head to wear it. He might have risen to martyrdom; he only sinks into a bishopric.'

only to set forth the Bishop's own course, as it appeared to the world at large, but also the springs and motives which determined that course, and the varied negotiations in which he was engaged with a view to bring it to a happier termination; and it will further be needful, before we reach the period of the Bishop's connection with the case, to trace at no small length the steps by which it reached the position in which it stood when his concern in it began.

That Lord John Russell's nomination should have been received with disfavour can excite no surprise. For full fifteen years, Dr. Hampden's name had been associated with theological views which were equally distasteful to the two great schools of opinion which divided the English Church; while the third section, which by this time has risen into importance, was then represented by the comparatively slender band of those who sympathised with Whately and Arnold. It was in the year 1832, that Dr. (then Mr.) Hampden preached the Bampton Lectures; and even now, when his pages can be read with cold dispassionateness, it is impossible to feel any surprise at the way in which they were received. In these Lectures[2] he surveyed the whole field of Christian theology with reference not to the doctrines taught but to the words and phrases used in expressing them. The origin and the use of these words and phrases Dr. Hampden ascribed in a very wholesale manner to the Scholastic Philosophy of the Middle Ages, although it was obvious that such a symbol as the Athanasian, and still more the Nicene, Creed had preceded the Scholastics by many centuries, and could in no way be included in the same category;

[2] The title of the Lectures was *The Scholastic Philosophy Considered in its Relation to Christian Theology.* By Renn Dickson Hampden, M.A. Fellowes, London, 1832.

and then he proceeded to condemn that philosophy, which he thus declared to be the parent of our theological language, as being false and unreal, both in its principles and in its method, describing it as 'an atmosphere of mist' between us and the primitive truth.

Moreover, Dr. Hampden's style was often obscure,[3] so that statements which he intended to refer solely to terminology might often be applied, even by a careful reader, to doctrine itself. Add to this what was afterwards urged in his behalf, that this obscurity was aggravated through hurried composition, owing to his having been somewhat suddenly called to fill the Bampton Lecturer's office, the ink being in some instances hardly dry when he went into the pulpit, and it ceases to be matter of surprise if he so expressed himself as to arouse serious suspicions of his orthodoxy. At all events, if his own personal belief were sound, of which his declarations in the explanatory introduction prefixed to the second edition left no doubt, was not his method a very misleading, not to say a dangerous, one? Was it not a weapon which in other hands might be wielded to the serious disadvantage of all which Christian men of every shade of opinion venerate? Even this was not all. In the year 1834, *i.e.* two years after the delivery of the Bampton Lectures, Dr. Hampden had published a pamphlet entitled 'Observations on Religious Dissent,' of which the drift was certainly free from that obscurity which had been the reproach, or the defence, of the Lectures. In this pamphlet, which appeared on the occasion of an attempt to force Dissenters on the Universities, Dr. Hampden used words of startling transparency;

[3] See *ante*, page 93, where S. Wilberforce humorously suggests that it might be well to 'pass a vote that Hampden should always preach in *Hebrew*.'

and while asserting on the one hand that 'it by no means follows that whatever can be proved out of Scripture must *therefore* be a truth of revelation,'[4] he also spoke of 'putting the Unitarian on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus Christ on which I should place any other Christian.'[5] He spoke also of 'all opinion as such' being 'involuntary in its nature,'[6] thus appearing to deny responsibility for religious belief; while, after defining the differences between Christian denominations as depending entirely on *conclusions* from Holy Scripture, he proceeded to show that such conclusions are purely of the nature of opinion. It is of course obvious that, in these cases also, the force of particular expressions may be largely modified by their context; and they are not adduced here with any view of renewing the attack either on Dr. Hampden or his writings, but only to explain, so far as possible, the passionate feelings which were aroused by his promotion. For these 'Observations' were regarded as furnishing the link between theory and practice. The Lectures had been on an abstract subject, were cloudy in their expressions, somewhat difficult to understand, and had no immediate bearing on positive action. They might be regarded as the dark sayings of a prophet which required authorised interpretation before the speaker could be held fully responsible for the inferences deduced from them. The 'Observations on Religious Dissent' seemed to supply this interpretation; and, what was more, they seemed also to apply it with the extremely practical result of effacing the difference between those who held and those who rejected the Church's teaching, and that in a case which

[4] *Observations*, &c. page 9. [5] *Ibid.* page 22.
[6] *Ibid.* page 4.

seemed likely to become matter of definite legislation at the actual moment. Men also called to mind that Dr. Arnold had recently written of the institution of the Christian priesthood as 'an institution unworthy of an enlightened understanding, and evidently founded on false and evil principles,' and as 'an accommodation to the notions and feelings of the East.'

All this being so, the nomination of Dr. Hampden to a Bishopric was not likely to have been acceptable to the clergy, even had there been no additional elements of exasperation. Unfortunately these also existed only too abundantly. From the date of the delivery of the Bampton Lectures Dr. Hampden had been steadily rising in official position. In 1833 he became Principal of St. Mary Hall. In 1834 he was appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy by a majority of two, the electors being the Vice-Chancellor and Proctors with the Heads of Christ Church, Magdalen, and St. John's. Lastly, in 1836, while the alarm for the security of the Church Establishment which followed the Reform agitation was yet in full force, and within two years from the publication of the 'Observations on Religious Dissent,' Lord Melbourne, the Prime Minister, had appointed him Regius Professor of Divinity.[7] This at once called attention to his previous utterances, and all parties in the University combined in petitioning the Heads of Houses to allow a censure of his writings to be submitted to Convocation. In so doing they specified in the fullest detail the doctrines which they considered to be impugned, and they cited with equal elaborateness the passages on which they founded their charges. Again and again was this petition rejected by a majority of the Heads, who throughout were friendly to Dr. Hampden; and when at last it was found im-

[7] See *ante*, pages 91, 92.

possible to induce them to submit a vote of censure on him with reference to specific charges, a compromise[8] was agreed to on both sides, and the Heads consented to the proposal of a Censure, not of specific errors, as the petitioners had repeatedly desired, but of Dr. Hampden himself, and on May 2, 1836, in a crowded Convocation, the following Statute was carried by a majority of 474 to 94:—

> Since it is committed by the University to the Regius Professor of Sacred Theology that he shall be one of the number of those by whom the select preachers are appointed, and, moreover, that his advice shall be had if any preacher shall be called in question before the Chancellor; but since he, who is now the Professor, in certain of his published works has so treated theological questions, that in this behalf the University has no confidence in him: it is enacted that the Regius Professor shall be deprived of the aforesaid functions until the pleasure of the University be otherwise, &c.

The numbers of those who voted for this Statute are sufficient to show that it was not carried by the action of any section or party within the University; certainly not by the Tractarian party, which was then a very small minority and regarded with general distrust; while Dr. Gilbert, the Principal of Brasenose, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, whom no one could suspect of Tractarianism, was the chief supporter of the anti-Hampden movement among the Heads of Houses. The authority of the Convocation to make such a Statute at all was not left unchallenged, and an opinion was obtained, signed among others by Dr. Lushington,

[8] The importance of these details will be seen later on, inasmuch as in 1847 Dr. Hampden made a great point of his opponents not having brought specific charges against his teaching: whereas, as stated in the text, his opponents were not only prepared to do so, but actually did specify the charges, and made every effort to get such a censure submitted to Convocation, but were only prevented by Dr. Hampden's own supporters among the Heads.

to the effect that until assented to by the Crown it was invalid, but no action was taken upon the opinion. So large a proportion of the Bishops also signified their disapprobation of the appointment, that, in the following year, December 21, 1837, Lord Melbourne made an attack, in the House of Lords, upon the Bishops generally for their objections to it. His remarks, however, only elicited from the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Howley) a firm defence of the remonstrances which he had personally addressed to the Prime Minister, declaring that 'nothing but a sense of duty could induce him to remonstrate against that or any other appointment;' adding, moreover, that it was the only Crown appointment against which he had ever objected, and that he still considered it 'extremely injudicious.' Upon this, Dr. Hampden called upon the Archbishop to justify his language, and a lengthy correspondence [9] followed, at the conclusion of which his Grace, while giving Dr. Hampden every credit for orthodox intention, said:—

> The main objection still remains—that if, on the great topics on which a man is to instruct students in Divinity, a man can so write that both common and learned readers mistake him, he is not a safe teacher. And this is sufficient ground for those who believe your declaration, not to withdraw their disapprobation of your appointment, though they may not urge their objections further.[1]

In 1842 this Censure received new emphasis through the failure of a determined effort to set it aside. In that year additions were made to the theological professoriate by the appointment of Professors of Eccle-

[9] *Correspondence between the Rev. Dr. Hampden and the Most Reverend Dr. Howley, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.* Fellowes, London, 1838. 8vo. pp. 38.

[1] *Ibid.* page 34.

siastical History and Pastoral Theology; examinations in Theology were instituted, and a Board of Examiners was appointed, with the Regius Professor at its head. The Heads of Houses, the majority of whom had always been favourable to Dr. Hampden, took the opportunity to endeavour to procure the repeal of the Statute of 1836. The attempt failed,[2] and the proposed repeal was rejected by a majority of 330 to 219, mainly on the ground that, however fully he had asserted the orthodoxy of his own personal convictions, Dr. Hampden, during the whole of his six years' tenure of his professorship, had done nothing either to explain or retract the expressions objected to. It is only fair to add, that Dr. Hampden had certainly done nothing in the interval to cause fresh irritation, and that his character and conduct were as far as possible from being those of a propagandist of strange doctrines. But the broad fact remained. Had the attempt of 1842 not been made it might have been urged that the Censure of 1836 was practically obsolete; but having been thus re-affirmed so recently as the year 1842, the Prime Minister was now nominating to a Bishopric a divine who lay under a censure which no one could call obsolete; while the divine himself had done nothing to retract the obnoxious statements which had compelled an Archbishop of Canterbury, in his place in Parliament, to deliver himself in the manner above quoted.

The consequence was that in all quarters the clergy were up in arms. Meetings were held and remonstrances adopted, more especially in the Dioceses of Bath and Wells, Exeter, and Gloucester and Bristol. An effort was made to represent the opposition as proceeding from the Tractarian party; but in the Diocese

[2] See *ante*, page 218.

of Winchester the movement was as strong as anywhere, and received the sanction and encouragement of the Bishop. As regarded the public press, the *Times* and *Morning Post* exclaimed indignantly against it; while the *Record* declared, that having at first been 'loud to denounce' the statements of doctrine in the Bampton Lectures and the 'Observations,' it had now 'no disposition to depart from the allegations then made.' Even Archdeacon Hare, who championed Dr. Hampden *himself* most gallantly, did not venture to defend his *appointment*, but wrote to the Dean of Chichester, Dr. Chandler, on December 14, 1847, that—

> You could not deplore it [the appointment], you could not condemn it, more than I did, as a most injudicious measure on the part of the Minister by whom he was appointed—as a wanton outrage on the feelings, prejudices they might be, but still strong and earnest feelings, of a large body of the Church, especially of the clergy,—as an act which would infallibly arouse vehement opposition, and break up the peace of the Church at a time when we were hoping for something like a lull after the storms of late years. . . . On these grounds I would have implored the Minister, on my knees, if it could have been of any avail, to recall what seemed to me an act of folly almost amounting to madness, of which I have never been able to learn the slightest explanation or defence. Greatly, too, should I have rejoiced to hear that Dr. Hampden had declined an office, whereby it was plain that he must give offence to so many of his brethren, coming among them as an object of general suspicion and aversion, instead of being regarded, as a Bishop ought to be, with confidence and love. By so doing he would best have consulted his own honour, and would probably have turned the current of opinion in his favour.[3]

These, then, being the circumstances under which

[3] *A Letter to the Dean of Chichester.* By Julius Charles Hare, M.A., Archdeacon of Lewes. J. W. Parker, London.

Lord John Russell's nomination was made, three days after its announcement Bishop Wilberforce received the following letter from Bishop Phillpotts :—

The Bishop of Exeter to the Bishop of Oxford.

Bishopstowe, Nov. 18, 1847.

My dear Lord,—Considering your special connection with the Palace, I abstained from addressing you (as I at first intended) on the appalling intelligence of Dr. Hampden's appointment. Yet I know your attachment to the Church too well to doubt your setting at naught the anger of *Ministers* (for most assuredly this is an act on the very face of it *not of the Queen*, but of her Ministers) when the real interests of the Church are concerned. I feel, therefore, that I ought to have addressed my first letter to you on this subject, as I purposed when I took up my pen and wrote to others.

Perhaps it is as well that I delayed, for I am now able to say that the only two of my brethren from whom I have heard warmly concur in the necessity or fitness of adopting some measure, and approve of the particular measure which I had suggested, of our addressing the Archbishop, praying his Grace to lay before Her Majesty our humble and most dutiful hope that she will not recommend for election to the office of Bishop a professor in the University of Oxford who is now under the censure of that University for holding and maintaining unsound doctrines, which he has refused to retract.

One of the two Bishops who have written to me is a Cambridge man, and he expresses an opinion (while he has no hesitation in concurring in the measure) that Oxford Bishops ought especially to move in the affair, and be more prominent in setting it forwards. This I feel to be an additional reason why I ought to have communicated with you in the first instance, but you will make allowance for the foolish delicacy which restrained me.

No particular measure is decided on, and I should much wish to know what you think best. Your's, my dear Lord, very faithfully,

H. EXETER.

The Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield) wrote more warily, and refers to the appointment thus in the course of two letters devoted mainly to other matters :—

Fulham, Nov. 24, 1847.

What say you to Dr. Hampden? His publications *since* the Censure are, as far as I have seen, perfectly orthodox; but he ought to have retracted or explained (if they were explicable) those passages which drew down upon him the Censure. It is an unfortunate appointment.

And again, on the 27th, the paragraph being marked 'Private,' he refers to the Episcopal Remonstrance mentioned in the Bishop of Exeter's letter of the 18th :—

I have told the Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Kaye) that I am ready to sign the representation about Dr. Hampden's appointment, although I am sure it will produce no effect but that which the north wind in the fable produces on the wayfaring man.

The next day the Bishop of Oxford wrote as follows to his brother Robert, giving some short account of what had been taking place respecting the representation referred to by the Bishop of London :—

The Bishop of Oxford to Archdn. Wilberforce.

Cuddesdon Palace, Nov. 28, 1847.

My dearest Brother,—I came down here on Friday evening (the night before last). We had in London much discussion on Hampden's case. I have long since resolved to have nothing to do with his consecration. After full discussion we resolved: 1. That Convocation ought not to take any notice of the appointment; 2. That *we* ought; and an address was drawn up to Lord John, protesting against it on various grounds, and pointing out the evils of his persistence. This is to be presented, if possible, by the Archbishop, and before the *congé d'élire*. It has been signed by London, Lin-

coln, Ely, Rochester, Salisbury, Bath and Wells, Gloucester, Exeter, and myself, and will be by many others. I expect *not* by Norwich, St. Asaph, Worcester, Llandaff, St. David's, Durham, and Chester.[3] I *hope* for all the others' signatures. I do not think it will succeed, but at all events we shall have done what we can.

All through the south the clergy are moving by archdeaconries, rural deaneries, &c. against it. I *hope* some fit persons will oppose it at Bow, if Lord John, as I fear he will, goes on to this. I wish Gladstone would undertake this, and have the matter thoroughly prepared; but *we* cannot move in this, because if the confirmation is stopped for alleged false teaching I am assured that the Archbishop has to assemble his comprovincials as assessors, and so it may come before us judicially. All, even Worcester, condemned the appointment as very bad. The Archbishop is not heartily with us, but he denies having 'assented.' He is frightfully tottering,[4] and seems to be much weaker than I have seen him before. My dearest brother, there is but one comfort. The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth, and He will 'take the kingdom.' Write to me here. I have a synod of Rural Deans this week.

[3] It may be convenient here to append the names of the occupants of the English Sees at the close of the year 1847. Those who signed the Episcopal Remonstrance are indicated by the use of capital letters.

Canterbury	Howley.	Llandaff	Copleston.
York	*vacant.*	Lichfield	Lonsdale.
LONDON	BLOMFIELD.	LINCOLN	KAYE.
Durham	Maltby.	Manchester	Lee.
WINCHESTER	C. R. SUMNER.	Norwich	Stanley.
BANGOR	BETHELL.	OXFORD	WILBERFORCE.
BATH AND WELLS	BAGOT.	Peterborough	Davys.
CARLISLE	PERCY.	Ripon	Longley.
Chester	J. B. Sumner.	ROCHESTER	MURRAY.
CHICHESTER	GILBERT.	St. Asaph	Short.
ELY	TURTON.	St. David's	Thirlwall.
EXETER	PHILLPOTTS.	SALISBURY	DENISON.
GLO'STER AND BRISTOL	MONK.	Sodor and Man	Eden.
Hereford	*vacant.*	Worcester	Pepys.

[4] This refers to the Archbishop's failing health. He died on the 11th of February next following.

Mr. Gladstone's[5] reply to the application referred to in the foregoing was this:—

Mr. W. E. Gladstone to the Bishop of Oxford.

13, Carlton House Terrace, Nov. 29, 1847.

My dear Bishop of Oxford,—Lord Campden showed me on Friday a note from Baddeley, in which it was stated that due measures were in progress for raising the question about Dr. Hampden at the confirmation. This, I presume, is enough for you, and indeed I do not know more myself.

I have declined taking any active part in lay proceedings against Dr. Hampden, first, because I think the indispensable condition of their efficiency is that they should originate with men who have never been called in question as opposed in theological party to Dr. Hampden; secondly, because I think that this subject will find its way into Parliament, and, if I am a mover of out-of-doors public agitation, I shall cripple myself fatally there, where I think I have a strong ground of complaint on the part of the *University*.

This subject and the Jews are not unconnected. I purposely avoid allowing myself to resolve until the time comes for a near and clear view; but my mind verges towards a vote, at whatever hazard, in their favour. In haste, my dear Bishop of Oxford, most sincerely your's,

W. E. GLADSTONE.

Reverting to the subject of the Episcopal Remonstrance, on December 1, the Bishop of Lincoln, who appears to have acted as a kind of secretary in the matter, wrote to the Bishop of Oxford, stating finally the number and names of the signatories:—

The Bishop of Lincoln to the Bishop of Oxford.

Warren's Hotel, December 1, 1847.

My dear Lord,—The names of the following Bishops are now attached to the Remonstrance—London, Winchester,

[5] Mr. Gladstone wishes it to be here added 'that some years afterwards he came to regret the whole original proceeding at Oxford (1836), and wrote to Bishop Hampden to say so.'

Lincoln, Bangor, Carlisle, Rochester, Bath and Wells, Gloucester and Bristol, Exeter, Sarum, Chichester, Ely, Oxon.

Llandaff declines because he has always thought Dr. Hampden an ill-used man; St. David's, not because he disapproves of the intended Remonstrance, but because the truth of the statement respecting the existence of a deep and general feeling does not fall within his own knowledge. The Archbishop,[6] having himself written to Lord John in the sense of our Remonstrance,[7] *but in stronger terms*, thinks it better that we should act independently of him. The Bishop of London will therefore transmit our document. I have received no communication from Lichfield, Chester, Peterborough, or Ripon. St. Asaph will not sign. I am, my dear Lord, your's very faithfully,

J. LINCOLN.

The text of the Remonstrance, addressed to Lord John Russell, and signed by the thirteen Bishops thus named by the Bishop of Lincoln, was as follows:—

My Lord,—We, the undersigned Bishops of the Church of England, feel it our duty to represent to your lordship, as head of Her Majesty's Government, the apprehension and alarm which have been excited in the minds of the clergy by the rumoured nomination to the See of Hereford of Dr. Hampden, in the soundness of whose doctrine the University of Oxford has affirmed, by a solemn decree, its want of confidence.

We are persuaded that your lordship does not know how deep and general a feeling prevails on this subject, and we consider ourselves to be acting only in the discharge of our bounden duty both to the Crown and to the Church when we respectfully but earnestly express to your lordship our conviction that, if this appointment be completed, there is the greatest danger both of the interruption of the peace of the

[6] Years afterwards the following entry appears in the Bishop's Diary:—

'*July* 1, 1855. Lord Aberdeen and we [*i.e.* the Bishop of London and Bishop Wilberforce] walked about grounds. He told me that the late Archbishop [Dr. Howley] had told him he would rather go to the Tower than consecrate Hampden.'

[7] It will be seen later on (page 439) that Lord John Russell alleged that the Archbishop had made no objection.

Church and of the disturbance of the confidence which it is most desirable that the clergy and laity of the Church should feel in every exercise of the Royal Supremacy, especially as regards that very delicate and important particular, the nomination to vacant sees. We have the honour to be, my Lord, your lordship's obedient, faithful servants,

&c. &c.

It will of course be observed that those who presented this Remonstrance in no way pledged themselves to any judgment of their own upon the orthodoxy or otherwise of Dr. Hampden's writings, but that they limited themselves to the single point of the inexpediency of the appointment under circumstances patent to everybody. Yet even so it was an extremely strong step, and, indeed, one wholly unprecedented. Never since the Reformation had thirteen Bishops united in a remonstrance against an episcopal nomination. Taking account of the fact that two sees were at that moment vacant, the signatories amounted to a majority of the existing Bishops; besides which the Prime Minister had not only received the letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, referred to by the Bishop of Lincoln 'in the sense of our remonstrance, but in stronger terms,' but he had also received the following from Dr. Longley, Bishop of Ripon, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury :—

The Bishop of Ripon to Lord John Russell.

Palace, Ripon, Dec. 2, 1847.

My dear Lord,—Although I do not feel myself at liberty to adopt all the expressions contained in the Memorial about to be presented by several of my Episcopal brethren to the head of Her Majesty's Government, on the subject of the rumoured nomination of the Rev. Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford, I would, nevertheless, desire to join in most respectfully but earnestly expressing my conviction that, unless your

lordship can be induced to pause before you press on the election of Dr. Hampden, and to wait until some means be found of proving the groundlessness of those apprehensions which it has excited, there is the greatest danger of the further interruption of the peace of the Church, and of the disturbance of that confidence which it is most desirable that the clergy and the laity of the Church should feel in every exercise of the Royal Supremacy, &c. &c.

C. T. RIPON.

The subjoined letter is from the Bishop of Chester, so soon to succeed to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, who did not sign the Remonstrance :—

The Bishop of Chester to the Bishop of Oxford.

Chester, Dec. 6, 1847.

My dear Lord,—To be seen in the same light an object must be seen in the same point of view. This has not been the case between us in the matter of Dr. Hampden, which is sufficient to account for our judging differently.

Unfortunately for me, *you were in the right point of view*,[8] and therefore probably have judged most correctly. After all allowance made for extracts, and quotations, and misrepresentations (of which there are some serious instances), there are many things in the 'Bampton Lectures' which I decidedly repudiate; but I thought it more charitable to form my opinion from the subsequent writings, especially the conclusion of the pamphlet on the Thirty-nine Articles. The effect of these later publications has been neutralized in your mind by what your situation gave you means of knowing, and it would have had the same effect on me if I had been equally cognisant of the facts.

But is it supposed that the Remonstrance can have the result of withdrawing the mitre from the head already bent to receive it? The offer might have been prevented if the Minister had done like other Ministers and taken wise advice; but after the offer made I do not see how it can be withdrawn. But the hands already lifted up are more than sufficient.

[8] The italics here and elsewhere are in the originals.

You are very kind in giving my son the advantage of your dinner-table. He taunts me undutifully, as the only non-latitudinarian Bishop (there, happily, he is wrong) who has not signed the protest. The fact is, those who were out of town were at a disadvantage. I am, my dear Lord, faithfully and affect^ly^ y^rs^,

J. B. CHESTER.

Three more letters written by the Bishop of Exeter to the Bishop of Oxford, the first prior to the delivery of the Remonstrance to Lord John Russell, the two others afterwards, but before the Prime Minister's reply had been received, add a few particulars:—

The Bishop of Exeter to the Bishop of Oxford.

(*Confidential.*)

Ecclesiastical Commission, Dec. 2, 1847.

My dear Lord,—I had an opportunity yesterday of talking with one of our ablest *Judges* on the question mooted in your letter. The learned Judge said, on my putting the point to him, that there must be a confirmation, or something equivalent, at which will be an opportunity of objectors stating their grounds, 'for,' said he, 'the Crown cannot know whether the nominee be canonically disqualified, and the Archbishop must have an opportunity of judging of this.' I found that he was as strong in indignation as any of us.

I find that no answer has arrived from Chester, Ripon, Peterborough, and Lichfield. St. David's does not disapprove our movement, but he declines joining in it, because he is not aware of the existence of excitement!

St. Asaph seems to approve, joined in making copies of the letter to be sent to absentees, but for some reason or other declines. I have not heard that any one has written to Norwich. Worcester pleads his brotherhood to the Lord Chancellor.[9] Y^rs^, my dear Lord, very faithfully,

H. EXETER.

P.S.—There is great firmness and accord among us.

[9] The Bishop of Worcester (Dr. Pepys) was brother to Lord Cottenham, then Lord Chancellor.

Lord John affects to regard the whole excitement as proceeding from the 'Puseyites.' I believe that our paper will be sent to Lord John *to-morrow*, waiting one more post for the answers of absentees.

The Bishop of Exeter to the Bishop of Oxford.

London, Dec. 8, 1847.

I have been in daily expectation of our receiving intelligence from Lord John, but a letter from the Bp. of London by this morning's post says: 'From Lord John not a word.' This looks as if my Lord was considering, and if *he* consider, Hampden is lost.

There will certainly be, as you will know, a strong struggle in the Court of Arches, if the case ever gets thither. My friend *the Judge* is confident that the Archbishop must have the power of deciding on the fitness of the Party, whether there be Election or Letters Patent. I expect that there will be Election *under Protest*, a very embarrassing step to the Government.

I have strong reason to believe that Lord John bitterly feels the awkwardness of the position in which he is placed, and would gladly recall the measure, if it were possible. Our Address gives him sufficient ground,—if he choose to take it. But is not obstinacy mistaken by him for firmness?

The Same to the Same.

London, Dec. 9, 1847.

A friend of mine has this day seen a person who had last night a letter from one of the Ministers, stating that it is determined by them to persevere in the appointment of Dr. Hampden.

Ministers deny that the Archbishop *has written against the appointment.* This is quite incomprehensible to me. The Bishop of Lincoln, *on his return from Addington*, assured me that the Archbishop had written *a stronger letter than ours* to Lord John; and this was to account for, or rather to compensate for, his declining to be the channel of communicating our letter to Lord John.

The Bishop of London makes no secret of this.

There will be, I hope, a well-advised resistance from *Hereford* as well as from other quarters.

It is confidently said that there is a suit instituted, or about to be so, before you against Dr. Hampden which you will probably (so it is supposed), 'in the first instance,' and without issuing a Commission, send by Letters of Request to the Arches. Is this so? Do not answer the question if you would rather not.

As to the light in which the Bishops themselves regarded their Remonstrance no better account can be given than that of the Bishop of Salisbury, a person of remarkably cool and balanced judgment, in a letter to the *Globe* newspaper:—

It was not [he wrote] intended as a hostile protest or as part of a system of agitation; but it was expressly designed to be a private and friendly representation to the Prime Minister of dangers which we saw reason to apprehend, and of which we were disposed to think he was not equally aware.

We did not assume the justice of the imputations against Dr. Hampden—for this would have been prejudging what might thereafter be the subject of judicial inquiry; but we deemed the fact of the existence of such charges, and the prevalence of the belief in them amongst the members of the Church, matters fitted to be submitted to the consideration of a Minister responsible for the exercise of the most delicate of the functions of the Royal Prerogative, with reference to a proposed appointment, known to us only by public rumour, and with respect to which we hoped that it might still not be too late either for other arrangements to be made, or for satisfaction to be obtained on the points which caused uneasiness.

The Remonstrance was transmitted to Lord John Russell on December 3. On the 8th he replied, skilfully evading the real drift of the protest, and making the most of any technical point which could be urged in favour of the appointment:—

Chesham Place, Dec. 8, 1847.

My Lords,—I have the honour to receive a representation signed by your lordships on the subject of the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford.

I observe that your lordships do not state any want of confidence on your part in the soundness of Dr. Hampden's doctrine. Your lordships refer me to a decree of the University of Oxford, passed eleven years ago, and founded upon lectures delivered fifteen years ago.

Since the date of that decree, Dr. Hampden has acted as Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and many Bishops, as I am told, have required certificates of attendance on his lectures before they proceeded to ordain candidates who had received their education at Oxford. He has likewise preached sermons, for which he has been honoured with the approbation of several prelates of our Church.

Several months before I named Dr. Hampden to the Queen for the See of Hereford, I signified my intention to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and did not receive from him any discouragement.

In these circumstances, it appears to me that, should I withdraw my recommendation of Dr. Hampden, which has been sanctioned by the Queen, I should virtually assent to the doctrine that a decree of the University of Oxford is a perpetual ban of exclusion against a clergyman of eminent learning and irreproachable life, and that in fact the supremacy[1] which is now by law vested in the Crown is to be transferred to a majority of the members of one of our Universities.

Nor is it to be forgotten that many of the most prominent among that majority have since joined the communion of the Church of Rome.

I deeply regret the feeling that is said to be common among the clergy on this subject. But I cannot sacrifice the reputation of Dr. Hampden, the rights of the Crown, and what I

[1] Upon this the *Times* remarked, in its leading article of December 14, that the answer was 'beside the mark. . . . No one disputes the Royal Prerogative: no one denies Lord John's perfect *right* to take his stand upon it. The question is, "Is it statesmanlike or patriotic to throw a fresh firebrand into our unhappy Church?"'

believe to be the true interests of the Church, to a feeling which I believe to be founded on misapprehension and fomented by prejudice.

At the same time I thank your lordships for an interposition which I believe to be intended for the public benefit. I have, &c.

J. RUSSELL.

To this letter it was replied in more than one quarter (though the parallelism between the cases is imperfect) that for a Prime Minister to give due weight to a University Censure would no more transfer the Royal Supremacy to that University than his treating a criminal judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench as a bar to preferment would transfer the supremacy to the Lord Chief Justice. But Lord John's mind was made up. In a reply, a few days after, to a protest from nearly five hundred laymen, including many peers and members of the House of Commons, he explicitly stigmatised the University Censure as an 'unworthy proceeding,' and declared the appointment calculated to 'strengthen the Protestant character of our Church so seriously threatened of late by many defections to the Church of Rome.' Though when adding that, 'among the chief of these defections are to be found the leading promoters of the movement against Dr. Hampden, eleven years ago, in the University of Oxford,' he might have known that *one only*, namely, Mr. J. H. Newman, of all the members of that large committee which organised the 'unworthy proceeding,' had so seceded. Later on in the month an address in favour of Dr. Hampden was signed by about two hundred and fifty members of the Oxford Convocation, including Dr. Tait, now Archbishop of Canterbury, while a counter address was signed by about four hundred and ninety of its members, and it was observed that the signatures

in favour of him included none of the leading members of the Evangelical party. Moreover, in the House of Lords, the Bishop of Rochester distinctly contradicted Lord John Russell's assertion that the opposition was a mere party move.[2] His words were:—

In the answer given to the Bishops, as well as in that given to the lay members of the Church, the noble Lord seemed to have entertained the mistaken belief that the opposition had arisen from a certain portion of the Church to which he referred. I can positively state that this is not the case. There is no person more opposed than I am to what are called Tractarian principles, and in my own diocese, comprehending upwards of six hundred clergymen, the feeling is almost unanimous against them. And yet in one district where a hundred and three clergymen assembled, all having different views, there were only two dissentients from the address which was agreed to. . . . I must state that I for one, many years ago, informed candidates for holy orders from Oxford that I should require them to have a certificate, not from the Regius Professor of Divinity, but from the Margaret Professor.

On the other hand, fifteen out of the twenty-two Heads of Houses in Oxford, who had always as a body supported Dr. Hampden, now signed an expression of confidence in him. But, in point of fact, the controversy was fast taking another form. It was no longer so much a question whether Dr. Hampden was or was not fully exposed to all the imputations cast upon his orthodoxy, but whether the Prime Minister was justified in his manner of exercising the Royal Prerogative. Was it *right* for Lord John Russell to put the Crown in the position of nominating to a bishopric

[2] The signatures to the Episcopal Remonstrance ought of themselves to have been accepted as a sufficient refutation of this charge. When Bishops differing so widely in theological bias as those of Winchester and Exeter, and so remarkable for moderation and caution as those of Ely and Lincoln, were found among the signatories, there was no room for such an allegation.

a divine in Dr. Hampden's circumstances without at least giving time and opportunity to bring the actual facts under the cognisance of some responsible and authorised tribunal? And when called on to pause, was it *right* for him to invoke the support of the spirit of religious partisanship, as he had done, in the replies already commented on by the Bishop of Rochester? Is not the spirit of theological party one which the responsible Minister of the Crown is especially bound to check and not to stimulate? And is it not one of the chief arguments for vesting the nomination to vacant bishoprics in the Crown, that it is almost the only way in which they can be filled without evoking that spirit?

At this juncture the Bishop of Oxford struck in. Ever sanguine as to what might be effected by fair means and personal representations, two days after the receipt of Lord John's reply, he addressed to him the following letter:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Lord John Russell.

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 11, 1847.

My dear Lord,—I hope that your lordship will allow me privately, and without consultation with my Right Rev. Brethren, to address to you a few words in reply to the answer you have returned to our joint remonstrances.

But first allow me to thank your lordship for your kind interpretation of that attempted interposition: I can assure you that you have only done justice to its intention. But will you suffer me to attempt to show you that its highest aim may be secured without incurring the danger which your lordship points out?

Your lordship remarks that the Remonstrance states on our part no want of confidence in Dr. Hampden's doctrines. This silence, I am sure, you will not be slow to attribute to a determination not to prejudge a question which might come

before us judicially. But, your lordship continues, 'we refer you to a decree of the University of Oxford,' and that to yield the nomination of the Sovereign to such an objection would be to sacrifice the Royal Supremacy.

I feel so strongly the force of this objection that I should esteem it fatal to any recommendation to which it did indeed apply. I am on the fullest conclusion of my understanding convinced that the best arrangement of a most difficult subject is that which leaves to the Crown the appointment of our Bishops. And such a conviction in favour of the Royal Supremacy must needs be strengthened in me by that heightening of the common feelings of loyalty into the strongest and most dutiful affection for the Person of my Sovereign, which must have been the effect of receiving from Her Majesty the unmerited kindness of years. I therefore could suggest nothing which could militate against the Royal Supremacy. But I trust that I can suggest a course *yet open to you*, free from this danger, and which would satisfy the Church. It is almost superfluous for me to lay down as my only axiom, that, as the Supremacy is vested in the Crown for the common good, it must be in its very nature *self-restrained*, and cannot, therefore, be rightly exercised for any person known to be unfit. Without therefore trenching in the very smallest degree on the Royal Supremacy, the Church may reasonably expect that before its exercise in behalf of any person resting under specific charges of disqualifying unfitness, he should be required to refute before a competent tribunal those specific charges. This was your lordship's decision as to charges of immorality, even though brought with every circumstance of improbability, against Dr. Lee; and he, no less than the Church at large, has reason to rejoice in your firmly requiring the disproof of such disqualification. Will your lordship consent to apply the same rule to the case of Dr. Hampden? He rests under a specific charge of unsound teaching brought by his own University ten years, and repeated four years ago. Of the substantial justice of that condemnation (I say nothing as to their, *still less as to my own*, opinion as to the mode or instruments by which it was obtained), a large proportion of the English Clergy and the thoughtful Laity are convinced.

Will your lordship apply to Dr. Hampden the rule you laid down for Dr. Lee, and require him to disprove before a competent tribunal the truth of these charges? This would satisfy the Church. Reasonable men do not wish to see Dr. Hampden put down by clamour; they would be the first to protest against a vote of the Oxford Convocation being set above the Royal Supremacy. But they believe that the highest of all interests requires that a Divine, openly charged by sufficient authority with unsoundness in the Truth, should not be consecrated a Bishop until he has cleared himself of the charge.

I most earnestly entreat your lordship to consider this suggestion. Its propriety in no way depends upon Dr. Hampden's unsoundness. I do not urge it on any conviction of my own of his unsoundness. It is the repute of unsoundness which, in my judgment, makes enquiry indispensable. This is, I feel confident, the course your lordship would pursue as to any cognate appointment. The right of appointing to the highest offices in the Army and at the Bar are equally vested in the Crown: yet your lordship would not thrust into the highest places of the Army an officer publicly condemned by a large section of his brother officers for poltroonery, or place on the Bench of Justice as a Judge one who lay under like censure for dishonesty, without first calling on them to disprove the charge, however unjust you personally believed it to be: nor can I believe that you will attempt in the far more delicate province of religious opinions a stretch of power which would be felt to be intolerable in these ruder professions. Believe me, my dear Lord, when I assure you, from my own very recent observation, that numbers who have resisted all *agitation* on the subject expect this at your hands.

They will not believe that you would permit the Tyranny of attempting to thrust on the Church, in the strength of laws made in old times to defend this Church and Realm against the foreign Bishop of Rome, a Divine lying under the imputation of unsoundness in the Faith, without requiring him first to disprove the truth of these charges before a competent tribunal. Such conduct would, I am certain, be most alien to your own principles of religious liberty; it would I believe be

highly dangerous to that Supremacy of the Crown which it is your Duty and your Intention to maintain; it would be fatal to the peace of mind and future usefulness of Dr. Hampden himself, who, I am certain, wishes for nothing so much as for the opportunity of proving himself to be as truly orthodox as we desire to find him.

One assurance to this effect from your lordship, *not withdrawing your nomination*, but promising such a Trial, would at once satisfy the Church. I press this the more earnestly because I see the very high probability of the question being brought *very speedily* to legal issue before an unsatisfactory [3] tribunal, through the agency of my own Court, unless your lordship's timely interference prevents the step.

I venture, therefore, to express the earnest hope that for the sake of your lordship's honourable name, for the strength of the Queen's Government, for the sake of Dr. Hampden, for the peace of the Church, and for the sake of Truth, you will not hastily reject this suggestion. I am your lordship's most sincere

S. OXON.

With what entire sincerity the Bishop made this appeal, how fully he believed that Lord John was open to its arguments, how completely he was at this time under the conviction that Dr. Hampden himself wished for such an 'opportunity of proving himself as orthodox as' the Bishop himself 'desired to find him,' and how sorrowfully he was alive to the danger to his own relations with Her Majesty which his course involved, the following extract from a letter written the next day to Miss Louisa Noel is a touching evidence:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 12, 1847.

Yesterday I wrote a long letter to Lord John Russell, in answer to his to our common Remonstrance. I said to him

[3] Meaning the Court of Arches, in which Sir H. J. Fust was then Judge. See *post*, page 451.

that what the Church wanted was an assurance that Dr. H. should be *tried* before he was consecrated. I believe he means this, and I am expecting Dr. Hampden's 'letter to Lord John' to be a *prescribed asking* for the opportunity of disproving charges, but we shall soon see. . . . Thank you for your words about quietness of heart. I hope I do know something more of it. But the time I get by myself in the chapel here is the best time of the day, and sometimes when I have gone in *hunted* by business I have been able to come out in the quietness of trusting in God. This whole Hampden business is *very* painful to me. It is so like hunting a man down that I am at times sick at heart, and feel I could do anything to show him how I hate persecuting him. Then it is painful to me to feel how probable it is that it will cost me that kindly trust of the Queen which, for no *end*, but for *itself*, I do, now God has given it me, value highly. But one cannot *act* on these things.

The foregoing was written before Lord John's reply was received. That reply was written promptly, and is given below:—

Lord John Russell to the Bishop of Oxford.

Chesham Place, Dec. 13, 1847.

My dear Lord,—I am much obliged to you for your friendly letter of the 11th instant. But, turn the matter which way I will, I cannot see that the course pointed out by your lordship would act otherwise than prejudicially. In the case of Mr. Lee specific facts of immorality were alleged which he could disprove. But the facts in Dr. Hampden's case are admitted. The question is whether they bear out a charge of unsound opinions in theology. A further question arises how far opinions published between 1836 and 1847 modify, explain, or clear up obscure expressions used in the Lectures of 1832.

It is obvious that this is a question which may lead to interminable controversy. The Bishop of Durham may think one way, the Bishop of Exeter another. The Bishop of London may think there is unsoundness, the Bishop of

Chester may think there is none. So that Dr. Hampden may be kept suspended between the cap and the mitre for years, to the infinite amusement of the idle crowd, but to the detriment of the Church and of the Royal Supremacy. I remain, my dear Lord, your's very truly,

J. RUSSELL.

And thus the Bishop's first effort to promote the peace of the Church failed utterly. It was of course a purely individual and unofficial application, and may perhaps in some measure have been prompted by the desire to avoid having to deal with the case officially. In any case the letter is of primary importance, because it gives the key to the whole of the Bishop's subsequent action, which has been so much criticised. The one motive of that action, the details of which are now to be given, was, *not* to procure a condemnation of Dr. Hampden, but to obtain a satisfactory settlement of the question of his orthodoxy, either (1) through the medium of the Suit in the Court of Arches, which he sanctioned while under the impression that his doing so involved no personal condemnation of the accused; or (2) through some communication from Dr. Hampden made directly to himself as his Bishop. From the first he had foreseen that it was impossible to avoid being mixed up with the controversy. So early as November 26, he had written to Miss Louisa Noel, 'I am receiving many pressing letters, from all sides, what to do about Dr. Hampden.' It was not merely that he was Bishop of Oxford, and that Dr. Hampden was a Professor in the University of Oxford, for, the University of Oxford being exempt from Episcopal control, the Diocesan has no more immediate power over the Professors than any other Bishop, but Dr. Hampden was also beneficed in his diocese, and held the Vicarage of Ewelme, which was at that time annexed to the

Regius Professorship of Divinity. It followed that whatever proceedings might be taken to bring the Professor to trial must, in the first instance, be brought before him as the Bishop in whose diocese he was beneficed. It was to this that the Bishop referred in his letter to Lord John Russell, and it was a prospect which was naturally most unpleasing. It was true that he need not himself personally sit in judgment on Dr. Hampden's orthodoxy, but might at once remit the case by 'Letters of Request' to the Archbishop, to be heard in his 'Court of Arches;' but it is plain that he shrank from this from the first, even as in the end he withdrew the 'Letters of Request,' as soon as he was advised that his issuing them committed him to an individual pronouncement against Dr. Hampden. And by the time when he was writing the foregoing letters he was in the midst of the most harassing negotiations upon this very subject.

Setting aside the general movements of clergy and laity in various parts of the country as merely voluntary and unofficial demonstrations, there were the following lines upon which formal opposition to the appointment could be undertaken. First of all, the election by the Chapter of Hereford Cathedral, consequent upon the *congé-d'élire*, might be contested, and it was understood that the Dean contemplated resistance. Next, supposing the election to be made, there was the confirmation of it at Bow Church, and this it was intended to oppose. Thirdly, a suit might be instituted under the Church Discipline Act of 1840 against Dr. Hampden as a beneficed clergyman in the Diocese of Oxford, before his Diocesan, for heretical teaching. It was this last by means of which Bishop Wilberforce became officially involved in the controversy. Very early in the history of the movement against Dr.

Hampden a statement was made in an Oxford Common-room, that

'Mr. Pott, the Bishop of Oxford's curate, wrote that the Bishop of Oxford wished an agitation to be got up in Oxford against Dr. Hampden, but that his (the Bishop's) name was to be kept in the background.'

To the letter containing this paragraph the Bishop replied thus:—

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 2, 1847.

I am obliged to you for sending me the note from —— College. It is entirely untrue that 'I desire to see an agitation got up, and my name kept in the background.' If I thought it right to get up an 'agitation,' it would be far from my custom 'to keep my name in the background.' I have been consulted, as was natural in a case which is exciting the deepest feelings of the Church, by many in various parts of my diocese, as to the question of getting up petitions, &c. I have always given one answer—that I can advise nothing upon a matter which may come before me judicially. I have (as I think my clergy have a right to expect that I should) pointed out to them, when they have asked for such directions, how they might without impropriety express their opinions; but whether they should express them or not I have declined to say, and I have refused to see addresses which I understood had been prepared, and on which my judgment was sought. I have not endeavoured to prevent or to excite the spontaneous expression of the opinions of the clergy.

At the same time I would make no secret to you[4] that I have found it my most painful duty as a Bishop of the Church to convey, in common with a majority of my brethren, my humble remonstrance to Lord John Russell against the rumoured appointment to the Episcopate of a clergyman who is so unhappy as to lie under the censure of the University of

[4] It will be remembered (see *ante*, p. 438) that the Remonstrance of the thirteen Bishops was not forwarded to Lord John Russell until December 3, the day after the above was written.

Oxford for unsound teaching. It was most painful to me to take this step, but with my views of duty I had no choice.

The Bishop of Oxford's own copy of this letter is thus endorsed :—

'with a P.S. enclosing Mr. Pott's letter, received after writing my own, and confirming it in every particular, and saying that *he had said nothing of the kind.*'

Two days afterwards the Bishop received the following :—

Rev. Charles Marriott to the Bishop of Oxford.

Oriel, Dec. 4, 1847.

My dear Lord Bishop,—I write at once to inform your lordship of the present state of the proceedings against Dr. Hampden, and to mention a step about which it will be necessary especially to consult you.

Distinct theological articles have been drawn up, and are in the hands of the lawyers to arrange and consolidate, and they appear to me to present a charge which an Ecclesiastical Court could not at all events set aside as too slight or too vague to be entertained. On some points I can hardly see how it could do otherwise than condemn.

Mr. Townsend is here for a day or two to inform himself of all the particulars he can, and to consult with persons concerned. And he gives it as his opinion that the opposition to confirmation would have less chance of being summarily set aside, if there were a suit pending in the Arches Court which could be referred to as a ground of objection.

If it be so, I believe there is no way but to apply to your lordship for Letters of Request, referring the case to the Court of Arches, which I suppose you would hardly like to issue simply in your own name. I doubt not, however, but that there are many respectable clergymen in the diocese who would readily appear as promoters.

If it will not be inconvenient, I should be glad of a few minutes' conversation with you on this subject, and could come out to Cuddesdon on Monday at any time that may suit

your lordship best. Should I be prevented, Mozley will supply my place. I remain your lordship's most obedt. servant,

C. MARRIOTT.

The Bishop replied:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Rev. C. Marriott.

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 5, 1847.

My dear Marriott,—It would not, in my judgment, be right for *me* to *promote* any suit against Dr. Hampden, but if such a suit were begun in the Consistory Court of this diocese I should at once transmit it by Letters of Request to the Court of Arches.

Probably this may sufficiently answer your question. If not, I expect to be at home until 2 to-morrow, and shall be ready to see you or Mr. Mozley.

The next letter, written in reply to a clergyman in his diocese, who had been asked to become the 'promoter,' and thereupon desired the Bishop's counsel how to act, states most explicitly the Bishop's views:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Rev. —— ——.

(*Private.*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 12, 1847.

I hardly know how to answer your questions. 1. I think it most desirable that there should be a formal trial of Dr. Hampden's writings, whether it lead to justification or condemnation. *This*, and not his putting down by numbers, is *the* thing to desire. 2. I think Sir H. J. Fust [5] will be about the most unsatisfactory pronouncer possible of a judgment; and 3. Therefore, if Government would announce, *as I expect them to do*, that Dr. Hampden shall be tried before he is consecrated, I would *not* wish him to be taken to the Arches Court. But 4. This is unavowed at present, and they who best know the course of things think that it would be the best plea at Bow that a suit had been begun. 5. Whether you should join in such proceedings I *cannot*

[5] Then the Judge in the Court of Arches.

advise for *this* reason:—(Confidential) I have said that, if articles are brought before me by men sufficient in the eye of the Church to bring them, and ready to pursue them in the Arches Court, I will then transmit the matter there, but *will not be prosecutor.* Now, if I advise any sufficient man to join, I should become prosecutor in fact. This, therefore, I must leave to you.

I have been all along expecting that Dr. Hampden's promised 'Letter to Lord John Russell' was a *prescribed* publication, in which he *was to ask* for a trial. I suppose to-morrow will probably show.

On December 15 Dr. Hampden's 'Letter to Lord John Russell' did appear, and to the Bishop of Oxford's extreme disappointment it not only contained no request for a judicial investigation, but limited itself to bitter complaints of persecution, to renewed affirmations of his own personal faith in the fundamentals of Christianity, and to attempts at discrediting the University Censure. To the Remonstrance of the thirteen Bishops it contained not the slightest reference, although that Remonstrance had been presented to the Prime Minister on December 3, and had been published in the newspapers on the 13th, two days before the publication of his own 'Letter,' which, though dated December 9, was not published until the 15th.

In spite of the almost universal dissatisfaction with his appointment, Dr. Hampden persistently attributed the opposition to the 'Tractarians;' he ignored the Bishops' Remonstrance, which certainly could not be ascribed to Tractarian proclivities on their lordships' part; and he made it a special ground of complaint that, in the University Censure of 1836, no definite charges were alleged against him. His words were:—

When a Censure of the University is passed, certain propositions are selected from the author's writings, and the

decree of Convocation condemns these particular propositions. Nothing of the kind was ever done in my case, nothing specific was ever alleged against me.

Perhaps nothing in all this unhappy controversy excited more remark, not only in Oxford but throughout the country, than this complaint; for it was well remembered that, as stated above, on pages 424 and 425, it was his own friends on the Hebdomadal Board who had refused to permit the promoters of the Censure to bring definite articles against him, and compelled them, in spite of their utmost efforts, to put up with the Statute actually passed.

Utterly disappointed in his expectation that Dr. Hampden would ask for a trial, the very next day, December 16, the Bishop signed the Letters of Request, by which he gave his sanction to the commencement of a suit in the Arches Court, in which definite charges would be alleged against Dr. Hampden, and full opportunity would be given him to purge himself of all suspicion of false doctrine.[6] In so doing the Bishop understood himself to pronounce no opinion of his own, either on the merits of the case, or even as to whether he himself considered that any case would lie, but believed himself to be acting purely ministerially. The promoters of the suit were taking action under the Church Discipline Act of 1840, and the Bishop was advised that, should he refuse the Letters of Request enabling it to proceed, it would then be com-

[6] The leading article of the *Times*, on the day on which Dr. Hampden's letter to Lord John Russell was published, says, 'We think that from all the documents that have appeared on this subject upon every side, including Dr. Hampden's own letter to the Minister, which we publish this day, an unanimous opinion may be inferred that there should be an immediate appeal to some such tribunal. Dr. Hampden and his friends have vehemently insisted from the first on the absence of a fair and impartial trial,' *i.e.* in the case of his condemnation at Oxford in 1836, whereas, as the *Times* continues, 'the persons Dr. Hampden considers to have been his enemies wished him every opportunity of defence.'

petent for them to apply to the Queen's Bench for a *mandamus* compelling him to grant them, and that such *mandamus* would certainly be granted. Afterwards, as will be seen, he was differently advised, and changed his course accordingly, but the above was the impression upon which his earlier action was based; and accordingly he wrote at once to Dr. Hampden to inform him of the step, and of the motive which prompted him to take it:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Professor Hampden.

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 16, 1847.

My dear Sir,—I have been applied to by several incumbents in this diocese to take the legal steps needful to obtaining a judicial decision upon the soundness or unsoundness of your published opinions. This I have declined to do, so far as myself promoting any suit against you reaches. But articles have now been regularly submitted to me, and I am called on to perform the purely ministerial act of remitting these articles to the Court of Arches for its decision. This ministerial act I have not felt at liberty to refuse to perform. It pronounces no opinion on the truth or falsehood of the charges brought against you: it merely extends to the declaration that there is matter which requires adjudication. It will afford, as I believe, to you the means of proving what I know you firmly believe—that your opinions have been misrepresented, and that you have advanced nothing which is contrary to the teaching of the Church of England: or if it should be pronounced that your statements are contrary to the formularies and authorised teaching of the Church of England, it would give you the opportunity of withdrawing what I feel sure you would not then maintain.

I trust, therefore, that you will believe me when I say that I take this step in no spirit of hostility to you; that I believe myself obliged to take it by imperative duty, and that its hostile appearance has cost me, as has every similar step which has been forced upon me, the deepest pain. I am anxious that

you should have from me the first intelligence of my having taken this step, and this leads me thus reluctantly to intrude upon you. I am, my dear Sir, very faithfully your's,

S. OXON.

It was only under pressure on the part of the promoters of the suit that the Bishop had consented to take this step; and no sooner was it taken than he induced them to consent to the withdrawal of the 'Letters' if he could induce Dr. Hampden to give satisfactory assurances as to some of the points on which the language of the 'Bampton Lectures' and the 'Observations on Religious Dissent' was most disquieting. Accordingly, still hoping to avoid a suit, the Bishop wrote the next day to Dr. Hampden thus:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Professor Hampden.

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 17, 1847.

My dear Sir,—Since I last night wrote to you I have been anxiously revolving the subject of my communication; and, in the earnest desire of promoting the peace of the Church and your own future usefulness and comfort, I desire to see, before matters reach the last extremity, whether my interposition as Bishop of this diocese may yet save the Church the injury of this struggle, and you the pain and risk of its doubtful conclusion.

My desire is to secure for the Church such a distinct avowal on your part of sound doctrine, and such a withdrawal of suspected *language*, as may terminate all opposition to your consecration. This I could not propose to myself if I believed you to hold heretical doctrine or thought it needful that you should admit that your past language consciously implied such error. But, believing you to hold the true faith, and believing that you have unconsciously, used language at variance with it, I may, as Bishop of this diocese, ask you, 1st, to assert your firm belief in the truths concerning which

your language is unhappily suspected by a large portion of the Church; and 2ndly, to withdraw that language, *not because you admit its unsoundness*, but because it appears unsound to your Bishop, and, with him, to a large proportion of the Church.

I will therefore take *seriatim* the truths, concerning your supposed denial of which articles are now prepared in reference to the Court of Arches, and ask you: 1st to avow your unhesitating reception of them. They are these:

I. That you believe that certain doctrines may be required to be believed, as necessary to salvation, on the ground that they may be proved by Holy Scripture.

II. That you believe that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as it is taught by the Church, is the expression of that which is from all eternity in the Divine Nature.

III. That you believe fully that 'The Son was begotten before all worlds, being of one substance with the Father,' and that it is 'necessary to salvation that a man believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

IV. That you believe that the offering of Christ upon the Cross was not only a means of reconciling us to God, but was also 'a satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.'

V. That you believe in the plain sense of the words 'all men to be by nature born in sin and the children of wrath,' and that such terms may be properly applied to infants before they may have committed actual sin; and that 'original or birth sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam.'

VI. That you believe, in the plain sense of the words, 'that the souls of the faithful after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh are in joy and felicity.'

VII. That you believe, in the plain sense of the words, that in Baptism we are made 'members of Christ,' and that they who 'with a true penitent heart and lively faith receive' 'the Holy Communion' do 'spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood,'—'are one with Christ and Christ with them.'

VIII. That you admit as containing true doctrine

the words 'the mystical union between Christ and His Church.'

IX. That you admit as a true and wholesome doctrine, that 'we have no power to do good works without the grace of Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.'

X. That you receive as true the words 'Pour Thy grace into our hearts.'

XI. That you believe the Sacraments of the Church to be 'effectual signs of grace, by the which God doth work invisibly in us,' and are 'means whereby we receive the same inward grace.'

I further ask you 2ndly to consent, for the peace of the Church, and in deference to the expressed opinion of your Bishop and others, to withdraw the 'Bampton Lectures' and 'Observations on Dissent,' *not thereby admitting* either that you intended in them to assert any doctrine contrary to those which you have since avowed, or that you now believe your language to contain any such assertion.

I most earnestly and affectionately pray you to weigh thoroughly this suggestion. I have already obtained from the 'promoters' of the intended suit a suspension of all proceedings until I shall have received your answer; and I firmly believe that, should you assent to my proposal, the Church at large would ratify their withdrawal of all charges, and see in your concession the true spirit of Christian peace, and that you would take your place among her Bishops free from those suspicions which, be they well or ill founded, must attach to you, and mar your usefulness, if you should without such concession succeed in forcing your way through all the obstacles before you to a disputed seat. I am, my dear Sir, most sincerely your's,

S. OXON.

And by the same post the Bishop wrote to the Prime Minister, informing him of the steps he had taken, and enclosing copies of both the foregoing:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Lord John Russell.

(*Private.*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 17, 1847.

My dear Lord,—I venture once more to entreat your consideration of a suggestion I wish to make to you concerning Dr. Hampden.

Some parties of the highest character in this diocese have applied to me to proceed against Dr. Hampden, under the Clergy Discipline Act, for teaching at variance with the Church of England, in order to bring to legal settlement the question of the unsoundness of his published statements. I have declined to promote such a suit. *They* have in consequence had articles prepared, and have called on me to proceed ministerially by transmitting the matter to the Arches Court, in which they propose to proceed.

I have not felt at liberty to refuse this purely ministerial act, and I enclose a letter (No. 1) which I yesterday wrote to Dr. Hampden announcing to him that I had signed the Letters of Request to Sir H. J. Fust. I have, however, thought over the matter deeply since, and I believe I see a way by which all opposition to Dr. Hampden's consecration might be withdrawn (certainly my own would, and I have reason to believe that those most warm in the matter in this diocese would submit to my decision) without any concession on his part which implies the admission of *conscious error either now or heretofore.* I can assure your lordship that the strength of the opposition to this appointment rests not on any party views, religious or political, but on a persuasion that the truth of God is at stake. In my own diocese some of the clergy who are warmest in the matter are those who are attached to extreme Protestant views. I enclose you (in confidence) a copy of the letter I to-day send to Dr. H. (marked No. 2), in the hope that an intimation from your lordship may aid him in making a concession *implying no retractation of doctrine*, and which would at once give peace to the Church and remove all hindrances to his peaceful consecration. I am, my dear Lord, ever very sincerely your's,

S. OXON.

Lord John Russell replied by return of post:—

Lord John Russell to the Bishop of Oxford.

Chesham Place, Dec. 18, 1847.

My dear Lord,—I do justice to the anxiety your lordship feels to put an end to the agitation on the subject of Dr. Hampden. But you must excuse me if I doubt the sufficiency and the fitness of the means you propose for that end. I must repeat the observation I made in my letter to the remonstrant Bishops. Dr. Hampden has for eleven years taught divinity as Regius Professor. Candidates for Orders were required by the Bishops, with the exception of five or six, to bring certificates that they had received from Dr. Hampden instruction in theology. The Bishops of Manchester and Salisbury, as I am told, sent away candidates who were not provided with Dr. Hampden's certificates. How is such a man to be interrogated upon articles framed, not by the Church, but by one of its Bishops, as if he were himself a young student in divinity?

This remark applies to two of the three articles drawn up by your lordship, to which I should not otherwise object. But the eleventh, asking Dr. Hampden to withdraw his 'Bampton Lectures' and his 'Principles of Dissent,' appears to me to require that Dr. Hampden should degrade himself in the eyes of all men for the sake of a mitre. He has repeatedly declared that in these works he has not intended to profess any doctrine at variance with the doctrines of the Church. Dr. Arnold could see nothing unsound in them, nor can the Bishop of Durham, or the Bishop of Chester,[7] or the Bishop of Norwich, or the Bishop of Llandaff. Indeed, I believe that Dr. Pusey himself, who must be considered as the leader and the oracle of Dr. Hampden's opponents, has written that he does not consider the opinions of Dr. Hampden unsound, but that they lead to unsoundness, and are, therefore, dangerous in a teacher of divinity.

Some of these opinions which are most loudly condemned are to be found in the writings of Archbishop Tillotson. Is

[7] But—see the Bishop of Chester's letter on page 435.

it intended to censure the opinions of Archbishop Tillotson, Archbishop Herring, and many others who have been ornaments of our Reformed Church? Is the attempt about to be made to end in the suppression of all learned inquiry, all dispassionate discussion, all freedom of thought and opinion? You must excuse me if I refuse to enter such a labyrinth, or to interfere any further with Dr. Hampden's judgment on his own position.

I am told that the Heads of Houses at Oxford are almost unanimous in reprobating the cry against him. I trust, therefore, that the enlightened, the tolerant, the learned part of our admirable Church will finally prevail, and I leave the issue to God and the right. I remain, my dear Lord, your's very faithfully,

J. RUSSELL.

P.S.—I return the letter to Dr. Hampden.

Dr. Hampden's reply to the Bishop's two letters was as follows :—

Professor Hampden to the Bishop of Oxford.

Christ Church, Dec. 18, 1847.

My Lord,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 16th and 17th instant, both of which reached me yesterday. Neither of them admitted of the instant reply which your lordship requested might be sent by the messenger who brought the second letter. But, as it is obviously important that as little time should be lost as possible consistent with due reflection on the subject, I hasten to give my answer to both.

As regards the first letter, I need say but little. I take it as an official intimation of some process being instituted against me through the medium of your lordship. And whether the process be put in action by yourself as its primary and ostensible promoter, or in a secondary but not less effectual sense by your transmitting it officially to the Court instead of withholding your assent or putting your veto upon it, is perhaps immaterial. For I take your second letter to be virtually a supersession of the first. It is to this letter that I now address myself.

As to both, however, I feel myself entitled to make one preliminary remark. Your lordship has omitted to name my accusers. Your reluctance to move without the previous interposition referred to in your second letter, and the pain with which you state you write the first, make me unwilling to lay much stress on the fact that the two letters combined only show me an avowed opponent in your lordship. As an incumbent of your diocese—though perhaps, from the peculiar tenure of my preferment, there is not so full a canonical relation between us as is the case with other incumbents—I might have hoped for your aid and protection against process from unknown accusers, rather than the contrary. I take your lordship's second letter as a recognition of this view. I therefore dismiss the first with a protest against any inference that I am bound to notice any act or attack without a name.

In regard to your second letter, your interposition is stated to be in your office of Diocesan. I might stop to ask under what branch of your lordship's jurisdiction the interposition takes place. If the queries which this letter contains had come from any other source, or been addressed to me under other circumstances, I think I should have been justified in considering that an insult was not only conveyed but intended to be conveyed to me, by having such elementary tests applied to one who holds the position I do. But, my Lord, I am sure your intention is to be a messenger and instrument of peace; and I know too well what even Christian warfare is, not to meet such a proceeding on your part in the like kindly spirit. On this ground, therefore, and in perfect respect to you as the Bishop of the diocese, and for your personal satisfaction, I unhesitatingly reply in the affirmative. I say 'Yes' to all your queries on my belief—in that sense in which they are the plain natural sense of the statements of our Articles and Formularies. I need not discuss them, for I have repeatedly affirmed every position in them drawn from those authoritative sources, commencing with my Catechism as a child, in the daily use of the Liturgy, in my subscription and adherence to the Articles, and in the constant use of my ministerial office. I have affirmed them in public and in private, in the pulpit, in my works, from the

Chair of Divinity, and in the other offices I have held in the University, and in the very works which have attracted so much notice, and have been subjected to so much misrepresentation. Nay, I may quote yourself as the latest authority in support of this statement; for I am glad to read that you believe me to hold the true faith, and that the cavils launched against what I have written are grounded on what merely *appears* to be unsound in language, though, even if it were really so, you do me the justice to say that you are sure I am unconscious of that unsoundness.

Your lordship speaks of the Church at large ratifying the withdrawal of all charges. Pardon me if I say that I have yet to learn that the Church at large has recognised any charges whatever. And again you speak of my 'forcing my way through all obstacles before me to a disputed seat.' My Lord, I force my way nowhere. I know of no obstacles, legitimate at least, to my taking upon myself the office for which I am designated, which will not have their due weight and effect; and I do not admit that my seat is disputed by any who have a right to call it in question, and other disputants will doubtless be duly met and disposed of.

I have, therefore, no fear that such usefulness as, under God's blessing, through the influence of His Holy Spirit, I may be made the humble instrument of diffusing, in the service of the Divine Head of our Church, will be marred in the diocese for which I have been selected by the head of that Church on earth to which we both belong.

In conclusion, my Lord, I must, in justice to other incumbents and members of the Church within your diocese, formally protest against being under any obligation to reply to the extra-judicial questions which you have put to me. I have already said that I answer them in deference to the motives which I attribute to your lordship in addressing me as you have. I forbear for the like reason to avail myself of the opportunity I might have taken of adverting to other acts of your lordship adverse to me and my appointment—acts which are difficult to reconcile with your conviction of the soundness of my faith. I hail your avowal of this conviction as a putting on one side of what has gone before; and whilst

I express my readiness to meet any opponent who shall legally implead me in any Court of legitimate jurisdiction, it will afford me no little satisfaction to find that any such proceedings, injurious as they must be, to the Church at all events, are prevented by your action as Diocesan, or rather on the far wider ground of Christian brotherhood and charity. I have the honour to remain, my Lord, your lordship's faithful servant,

R. D. HAMPDEN.

This letter was another disappointment to Bishop Wilberforce. It was a disappointment, not only in that it absolutely ignored the proposals contained in the latter part of the Bishop's letter, but still more in respect of the manner in which Dr. Hampden signified his assent to the several propositions which the Bishop had submitted to him. The Professor spoke of it being little less than an 'insult' to propound such 'elementary tests' to one in his position; and yet it was but the plainest matter of fact that these elementary tests had been most carefully constructed, so as to enable him to clear himself from imputations which arose naturally from language which he had employed, and which he had refused to alter or withdraw. It was just because 'both common and learned readers,' to borrow Archbishop Howley's words, alike failed to see how Dr. Hampden's published language could be reconciled with these elementary propositions, that Bishop Wilberforce was so anxious to elicit from him such a specific assent to them as might override existing suspicions. For days together, prior to his letters of the 16th and 17th, the Bishop had been closely engaged, at his palace at Cuddesdon, with some of the most earnest and sober-minded of Dr. Hampden's opponents, in a minute examination and discussion of the objections to the 'Bampton Lectures.' The discussion was not by any means one-sided. The Bishop, with that

spirit of fairness which distinguished him, pressed to the uttermost the consideration that the lectures were concerned not with Christian doctrine, but solely with the mode in which Creeds and Articles expressed that doctrine, and that the writer was not to be held responsible for inferences drawn by others.[8] Still, even the Bishop was unable to deny that the language was such as not merely to leave the Professor's own convictions doubtful, but such as might involve indefensible conclusions. It was as the result of these conferences that the list of propositions was drawn up, which appeared in the Bishop's letter, and which may be called 'fundamental' with at least as much fitness as Dr. Hampden called them 'elementary.' Even as regards so 'elementary' a proposition as the very first upon the list, Dr. Hampden could not have forgotten that over and over again he had written such sentences as: 'Strictly to speak in the Scripture itself there are no *doctrines*;'[9] 'the principle for which I contend' is that 'no conclusions, however correctly deduced, however logically sound, are properly religious truths;' and that 'no intellectual or speculative or theological conclusions whatever result from the truths of Scripture.'[1]

It would be easy to go through the whole series of Bishop Wilberforce's queries, and to show how each one of them referred to definite statements on Dr. Hampden's part which had caused genuine uneasiness to persons not at all disposed to make a man an

[8] This statement is founded on a long and minute record, in the handwriting of one of those who were urging the Bishop to take action against Dr. Hampden, of the successive conferences at Cuddesdon, mentioned here and subsequently in the text. This narrative makes it perfectly certain that the promoters and their legal advisers understood it to be the Bishop's desire to act as peacemaker between themselves and Dr. Hampden, and that it was with a view to pacification that these propositions were drawn up, and the Bishop's letter of December 17 written.

[9] *B. L.* page 374. [1] *Observations on Dissent*, pages 8 and 12.

offender for a word, and that all which Bishop Wilberforce desired was to set Dr. Hampden straight with them. Enough, however, has surely now been done to exhibit the real drift of Bishop Wilberforce's letter, and to explain his disappointment when Dr. Hampden's reply entirely ignored the specific reference with which each proposition was set before him. That reply was written on the 18th. The Bishop acknowledged it on the 20th :—

The Bishop of Oxford to Professor Hampden.

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 20, 1847.

My dear Sir,—You have done no more than justice to the earnest desire of securing peace at any cost but that of Truth which dictated my letter to you. Nothing else, as you justly observe, could have led me to venture to propose to you those purely extra-judicial questions which you were of course at perfect liberty to decline answering.

As, to my deep regret, you feel yourself unable to accept my full proposal by withdrawing the works of which the orthodoxy is questioned, I need trouble you with very few remarks before I close this correspondence. Only, as to the proposal itself, let me distinctly repeat that it was intended to express my conviction that your theological language had been unconsciously unsound, and that if you had been able (under protest as to your admission of its unsoundness) to sever yourself from it, the objection taken by so many to your consecration would cease to exist.

I must beg you to notice that my words were, not that your language merely '*appeared* unsound,' but that, 'whilst I believed you to hold the true faith, I believed you to have unconsciously used language at variance with it.' This, I have reason to think, is the impression of the great majority of those who have thought it their painful duty to protest against your nomination. It is to your published language that they object, as being at variance with the truth ; it is on *this*, and not on

your personal belief, that they deem it their duty to obtain the judgment of a competent Court.

You wish for the names of your 'accusers.' It is the numbers of those whom you class under this title which makes it difficult for me to answer your question. I might send you the names of more than one hundred clergymen in this archdeaconry alone who have addressed me to this effect; and it is only as *representing them* I can mention to you the Rev. W. H. Ridley, the Rev. E. Dean, the Rev. H. J. Young, as having signed formally the legal document to which I referred. The inquiry for which they asked I did not feel at liberty to prevent by refusing to perform an act so purely ministerial, that had I refused they might have applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a *mandamus* to compel me to give reasons for my refusal to perform it. I did all which seemed to me to be within my power, when I interposed with the attempt which, even though unsuccessful, I cannot regret, since it will, I hope, abide in your recollection as a proof that, whilst resisting what appeared to me a dangerous misstatement of most important truth, I have no feelings but those of perfect charity towards yourself. I am, my dear Sir, very sincerely your's,

S. OXON.

With this letter terminates the first stage of the history of Bishop Wilberforce's connection with this unfortunate controversy. He had obtained from the promoters an understanding that the Letters of Request should not be used if he could obtain satisfactory assurances from Dr. Hampden; he had made the attempt to obtain those assurances, with what result has now been seen. To all appearance the suit must proceed. It only remains to add that the consultations between himself and the promoters, together with their legal advisers, which resulted in the letter of the 17th, had taken place amid the pressure of business accompanying an examination of candidates for Holy Orders, and that the subject-matter of these discus-

sions was not so much the book of the 'Bampton Lectures' itself as the selected passages from it, and very especially from the 'Observations on Religious Dissent' upon which the promoters mainly rested the case which they desired to bring before the Court of Arches.

No sooner, however, had the Bishop's last letter to Dr. Hampden been despatched, than a fresh circumstance, having a very important bearing on the subject, occurred, and on Dec. 21 the Bishop sent for the legal adviser of the promoters to inform him of it. For the day after this letter was written, the day therefore on on which Dr. Hampden would receive it at Christ Church, was the day, Dec. 21, when the Bishop was holding an Ordination in Christ Church Cathedral, and staying with Provost Hawkins as his guest. While the Bishop was thus staying with the Provost, Dr. Hampden wrote to the Provost, stating that,

> the 'Observations on Religious Dissent' were not being sold or circulated with his sanction, but against his wish; that he had never reprinted the pamphlet since the second edition was sold;[2] and that if now sold it was against his leave;

and the contents of this letter Provost Hawkins communicated to the Bishop.[3]

Of course this fact altered the whole complexion of the case. Even in the conferences at Cuddesdon above referred to it had been admitted that the legal strength of any case against Dr. Hampden must rest largely on the 'Observations;' and accordingly, on learning that Dr. Hampden was no longer legally

[2] The *second* edition had been published as far back as 1834; and as no charge could be brought under the Clergy Discipline Act with reference to anything done more than two years back, this at once removed the 'Observations' from legal cognisance.

[3] See *post*, Letter to Miss L. Noel, page 498, and Letter to Prof. Walker, page 500.

liable for anything written in the 'Observations,' the Bishop wrote to him at once to withdraw the letter of December 20, and opened a fresh series of consultations with the promoters, in the course of which he urged most forcibly that the matter should be allowed to drop; adding also that the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Howley, had written to him, strongly advising for the sake of the Church that the Letters of Request should be withdrawn. The Bishop (December 22) declared that he had now been 'reading over the Lectures,[4] with all the study he was master of; and the more he read the more he was satisfied that they are intended to contain a discussion of the terminology, and a history of its formation, rather than an assertion that the dogmatic truths themselves are to be doubted, or are not of authority:'[5] the general result of a long debate being his expressed conviction that there was 'little if anything really objectionable in the *intention* of the writer, though *very much in his language.*'[6]

The question was then discussed as to the position

[4] Not that he had never read them before, but that he had not read them specifically as a judge and with Dr. Hampden's explanations. See *post*, Letter to Prof. Walker, page 499.

[5] These quotations are made from the MS. narrative mentioned in the footnote to page 464.

[6] It is worthy of notice that so acute and accomplished a theologian, and one so specially versed in the Scholastic Divinity, as Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce, writing to the Bishop at this time, said:—

'I have never doubted that Hampden did not understand the nature of the poison which he vended. He was evidently crammed by others, and had no view whatever in his own mind.' And again:

'I fully acquit Hampden of intentional Socinianism, and I think Newman was in this respect too hard, that he did not distinctly state so much. I perfectly remember your saying to Newman, "Is it not reckoned unfair in Theology to impute to a man the conclusions from his opinions?" and he said, "Yes, it is; but *they* would have it so." Now this is unjust as regards a *man*, but not, I think, as a charge against a *book*. He may not carry his principles out; but in time they will be carried out by others. Blanco White is Hampden's *book* gone to seed. I don't charge the *man* with the same sentiments.'

At this distance of time it may be desirable to explain that Mr. Blanco White had long been a prominent member of the Oriel Common Room, and the intimate

of the Bishop in respect of legal proceedings—whether under the Church Discipline Act he *could* refuse to sanction proceedings, and, if so, under what circumstances; or whether it was the fact that he was simply ministerial, as up to this time he had understood, and therefore without any choice in the matter. It was admitted by the lawyers present, that his refusal could be more extended in cases of alleged impugnment of doctrine, of which he was a competent judge, than of alleged immoralities depending on evidence. It was stated that cases might come before a Bishop in these three forms:—(1) an objection might be made of doctrine or morals, which the Bishop might consider untenable altogether, and accordingly decline to proceed upon in any way upon his own responsibility; (2) wherein he was so certain of the facts as to be compelled to proceed without a doubt; (3) where the facts as to immorality, or the questions as to doctrine, were so doubtful that the Bishop felt it necessary to let the tribunals decide. In these cases a Bishop's course would be pretty clear. The actual case seemed to fall under a different category; that, namely, of one in which a wide scandal existed, where yet the Bishop did not believe the facts alleged, or consider that unsound doctrine

friend of Archbp. Whately and Dr. Hampden, and that by this time he had lapsed into formal Socinianism. In 1832, while the Bampton Lectures were being written, Dr. Hampden was in incessant communication with Mr. Blanco White. It is his influence chiefly that Archdeacon Wilberforce refers to when he speaks of Hampden being 'crammed by others.' Mr. B. White used to express the most lively expectations as their teaching and contents, and as to their effect as a blow to theological dogmatism. The actual lectures disappointed him, as stopping short of what he had expected, and his own phrase was, 'Mr. H. is a rising man, and cannot afford to go farther.' Still the Bampton Lectures were spoken of as standing in a relation to Mr. Blanco White's conversation, analogous to that of certain writings of Xenophon and Plato to that of Socrates.

A full account of Mr. Blanco White was given by the late Professor Mozley in the *Christian Remembrancer* of July 1845, and the article has been reprinted in vol. ii. of his collected Essays.

was taught; and the question was, whether in *this* case a Bishop would be bound to submit the case to the Court of Arches? The Bishop contended that if he did so he would be bound to accompany the 'Letters of Request' with a letter to the Dean of the Arches setting forth his own opinion: which was represented to him as being inconsistent with a strictly legal and technical proceeding like the transmission of 'Letters of Request.' This alternative then being inadmissible, the only remaining course was to consider that in such a case he ought not to transmit them at all—in other words, that in such a case his action was *not* purely ministerial, but that it was so far *judicial* as that it involved his having decided that there was at least a *primâ facie* case against the accused. This conversation is here related as giving the key to the Bishop's subsequent use of the word 'judicial,' both in his printed letter to Dr. Hampden and elsewhere. Until now he had not regarded himself as called upon for any personal or official expression of opinion whatever, and his sole action had been that of endeavouring to mediate between the promoters and Dr. Hampden. On the one hand he had been the medium of representing their case to Dr. Hampden; on the other hand he had been endeavouring to obtain from Dr. Hampden such concessions as might allay the enormous ferment which existed. Up to this time it was simply the general peace of the Church which he had had in view; not what course of action he as Bishop ought to take. Now, however, that he had to consider what was right for him to do, the case was seriously altered. If *he* must act judicially—*i.e.* if the transmission of the Letters was a voluntary act on his part, and implied that he as Bishop had come to the decision that Dr. Hampden had maintained actual

heresy,[7] and that such decision was based upon the text of the 'Bampton Lectures' alone, as taken apart from the (practically) withdrawn 'Observations on Religious Dissent'—then he could hardly avoid the conclusion that for him to transmit the Letters of Request would involve an untruth. Accordingly the Bishop at once wrote to the Provost of Oriel, through whom he hoped to keep up negotiations with Dr. Hampden.

The Bishop of Oxford to the Provost of Oriel.

(*Private.*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 24, 1847.

My dear Provost,—I have withdrawn from the promoters of the intended suit the Letters of Request. Several causes have led me to this decision.

First, the ground was cleared for my doing so by my finding upon further inquiry that in matters of doctrine the Bishop's act is far more judicial and less simply ministerial than I had supposed; and, therefore, that I had the *power* of withdrawing the suit without the concurrence of the promoters.

The ground being thus clear, I thought that, in Dr. Hampden's consenting to answer the questions in detail which I had extra-judicially put to him, in the virtual withdrawal of the 'Observations on Dissent,' and in his admission in his letter to Lord John Russell that his language might be incorrect, and in his readiness to amend it, I saw sufficient reason why, as his bishop, I should refuse to let my office be made the means of a criminal suit.

This I have done; but I long to do more. Perhaps if Dr. Hampden knew through you that I do heartily and earnestly desire to smooth his way to the place to which he has been nominated, and that, in now desiring communication with him, I wish not to dictate terms as if I were in a hostile attitude,

[7] For this is the point. The Bishop did regard the language of the 'Bampton Lectures' as unsound, as his letter to Dr. Hampden given at pages 482 and 488 declares, but he could not truthfully say that he regarded it as so unsound as to sustain a charge of formal heresy.

but to use the office of a bishop, and my accidental connection with him through Ewelme, for the purpose, first, of obtaining the cordial concurrence of my brethren on the Bench in his consecration (which I think I can do), and secondly, for removing doubts, difficulties, suspicions, and offence from many of his brother clergy who have no personal hostility to him, nor any addiction to Tractarian views, he would make such friendly concessions (and they are not many) as would enable me to take this line. I feel *sure* that if he would direct Parker to cease selling the 'Observations,' and if, acting on his offer in his letter to Lord John Russell, he would receive from me the list I enclose, and give me his assurance that these causes of misapprehension should be removed from any future reprint of the 'Bampton Lectures,' in addition to the assurance he has already given me of his personal soundness and what has already passed between us, I should have influence enough to secure the withdrawal of the Bishops' Remonstrance, that I should be able to quiet many minds now greatly disturbed, and I *believe* that I could prevent all opposition at Bow Church or elsewhere. Will Dr. Hampden give me this opportunity? Can you suggest how I can most easily approach him? During his silence as to my last letter I hardly know how to write to him. Can you see him and endeavour to open such a negotiation? You are at liberty to *show* to him or to *read* this letter or its inclosure if you think it desirable. I am, my dear Provost, most truly your's,

S. OXON.

The Provost replied the same day:—

The Provost of Oriel to the Bishop of Oxford.

Oriel College, Dec. 24, 1847.

My dear Lord,—Dr. Hampden, I presume, has not returned, and will not return, to Oxford to-day; but I will do my best endeavours to find and act with him when I can.

I left such a message with Miss Hampden early this morning as I feel confident will bring him to me as soon as he receives it; and probably will prevent his doing anything which can interfere with your kind intentions.

At this moment I can only glance of course at your list of questions, and cannot enter into them. I see some that appear to me at first sight not to admit of such answers as will satisfy many of his opponents. And in general, I think, Dr. Hampden could not bind himself specifically to alterations in his 'Bampton Lectures,' such as would be satisfactory to them in all cases, because he would thus admit some of the very theories which his lectures were designed to correct. And to pledge himself to do so would only lead to a future attack upon him for not having fulfilled engagements which it was impossible for him to keep consistently with the maintenance of what he believes to be the truth.

In a word, it is one thing to declare to me his intention of doing his best to *improve* his work in a future edition, taking advantage for that purpose of all objections that have been made to it, and quite another thing to engage so to *correct* it as shall remove all objections. Some objections may rest upon theories which he cannot allow, and may be not sound objections, although in the letter they may appear to agree with some *word* in an Article.

I write in great haste for such a subject; but this may give your lordship some idea of the kind of difficulty I foresee in the case.

However, I am truly glad your lordship has seen ground for withdrawing the Letters of Request; and I need not assure you that I will do what I can to smooth the way towards a peaceful termination of this very unhappy affair. Ever, my dear Lord, your lordship's faithful friend,

EDW^{D} HAWKINS.

The next day, Provost Hawkins wrote more fully:—

Oriel College, Dec. 25, 1847.

My dear Lord,—Dr. Hampden returned to Oxford last night, when it was too late and he was too much fatigued to see me: and he went off at 8 this morning to Ewelme to take part in the duty to-day and to-morrow and return to Oxford on Monday. He will not, I apprehend, take any step in the interval.

Meanwhile let me add something to the letter I wrote last night whilst your lordship's servant waited for my answer.

I propose to send to Dr. Hampden to-night your lordship's letter, but *not* to use the permission you further give me to send him also the list of questions and references. Your letter will show him clearly your good intentions, although I do not think he ought to comply with all your suggestions; for which I will add one or two reasons, which perhaps I had better show to him likewise.

But I do not think the list of questions, &c. such a finished document as you would like to put forth on so very grave a subject; and, further, it appears to me that he ought not to subscribe in detail to such a document.

Your lordship well knows how earnestly I have had to contend for an honest subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles; but we ought not to have new Articles. And it amounts to a new Article if a person is called upon to subscribe to sentiments, and much more to single words, selected either from the Liturgy or the Thirty-nine Articles themselves. 'Satisfaction,' *e.g.* may be a very proper term, but it has not been laid down as a term to which we are to subscribe; much less must we take it out of one Article, where it has its proper use, and transfer it to another, where it has not been used at all, and where, if it had been used, it would have been employed for a different purpose. There are other instances of the same kind. And Dr. Hampden ought not, in justice to the Church, in order to relieve himself from a temporary difficulty, to give his assent to any new Articles of Faith so drawn out of our Articles. Still less, perhaps, ought he to assent to propositions which are really founded upon erroneous theories, such as *physical* theories of the efficacy of the Sacraments or of the operation of the Holy Spirit upon our souls.

I have no leisure to enter at length into such questions; but these few words may indicate to your lordship why I venture to say that Dr. Hampden ought not to subscribe to such a document as I refer to. Several things in it, doubtless, he could answer satisfactorily at once. But it would be needless because he has often done so before. To others he either ought not to return answers, or he must return such as

never could be satisfactory to those who are the most opposed to him, because they hold opinions which his work is calculated to explode when it shall come to be clearly understood. The true use, as it appears to me, of a document of this kind is not that he should subscribe to it, or engage so to correct his work as to satisfy all his opponents, but that he should know the *nature* of the objections, &c., and be guided by them to avoid all unnecessary *offence* to others, whilst he maintains what he believes to be the truth. This use of it, I make no doubt, he will gladly make if he has opportunity.

But the very sight of documents of this nature makes me congratulate your lordship on having found yourself able to withdraw the Letters of Request. I say this not on Dr. Hampden's account—for I conceive if he were tried by a really competent tribunal he must be acquitted; nay, it might be for his advantage personally that he should be tried fairly, which hitherto he has never been—but I say it for the sake of religion and the Church. It would have been inexpressibly lamentable that such high and sacred subjects as your questions touch upon should be discussed in a public court, and let me add, the suit being promoted by persons who, in my judgment, do not appear with all their piety to understand the reverence properly due to such high and mysterious questions. They are really fit only for the most reverent discussion of divines, even where they are fit for discussion at all; and our inability to fathom them is not always sufficiently perceived.

It is not for me to suggest any proceeding to your lordship, much less to your brethren on the Bench of Bishops. But I cannot but say that to a considerable extent I think you already have the means in your hands by which you may greatly soothe, if not altogether allay, any agitation which, however it may originate in zeal for the truth, is hurtful to the Church and truth and peace.

If you cannot, *from the very nature of the subject*, frame any set of questions which it would be *safe* for your lordship to issue or for Dr. Hampden to sign, then you must resort to what you already understand, viz., that he does not *desire* to give offence, that he desires only to teach the truth with as

little offence as possible; that he will of course, therefore, amend what he perceives to have been said rashly, unguardedly, or incorrectly, if he has the opportunity, but without any specific pledge as to particular passages.

And, practically, I should think you had enough to act upon without either pledges or concessions. You have his Letter to Lord John Russell to refer to, with his Inaugural Lecture, Lecture on the Articles, and many various publications, for his soundness in the Faith, which you do not doubt and have never directly impugned. Should he acknowledge what he has written or said to me, as no doubt he will, you have *facts* to go upon as to the discontinuance of the publication of the 'Observations,' and a declaration of his *intention* to improve the 'Bampton Lectures,' given without any threat or dictation, and better therefore than any extorted promise, but still not implying pledges which he could not redeem (and should not therefore give) without a compromise of truth.

Lovers of justice should, it seems to me, be satisfied with this. There are parties whom nothing, that he can properly give, will satisfy.

Knowing as your lordship does my feelings as well as principles, you will not wish me to send any apologies for the freedom of this letter; but will, I hope, be glad to see the view taken of the question by a third party without any concert with Dr. Hampden himself. Ever, my dear Lord, your lordship's faithful friend,

EDW^{D} HAWKINS.

The reader will observe Provost Hawkins' expression in the last paragraph but two, where he says, 'should he (*i.e.* Dr. H.), acknowledge what he has said to me,' *i.e.*, on the two points of (1) the withdrawal of the 'Observations,' (2) 'his intention to improve the Bampton Lectures.' As matter of fact Professor Hampden never did 'acknowledge' these declarations, and to that extent the Bishop's position was weakened, inasmuch as he acted upon the supposition that the Professor would have no objection to admit what he had

written and said to the Provost.[8] His reply to Provost Hawkins was as follows :—

The Bishop of Oxford to the Provost of Oriel.

(*Confidential.*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 26, 1847.

My dear Provost,—I should have answered your letter of Friday at least with a few lines yesterday, but that I was all day in bed with a relapse of influenza.

I have now another letter to thank you for. Will you let me say at first, that I am quite glad you should show to Dr. Hampden every word I wrote to you ; *if it is to be received as it is written* in the spirit of friendly confidence, which prevents the necessity of every word being weighed on every side lest it should be capable of misconstruction. I am sorry to have to add this caution : but the notice of my former letter in the 'Morning Chronicle,' with a warning I received yesterday from a friend moving in those circles, that 'Dr. Hampden was about to publish every word I wrote to him *for the edification of the Public*,' seems to make it needful.

It would of course be very easy to represent that as an arrogant dictation of a new Confession, which is in fact only a friendly attempt to use the office of Bishop of the Rectory of Ewelme for removing widely-felt difficulties in the Church. I may say to you in confidence, that the Bishops for whose expressed opinion Dr. Hampden would feel most value, *are* ready, if I say to them as Diocesan, 'Dr. Hampden has given me as Diocesan a satisfactory explanation,' to adopt my judgment. I am not, therefore, arrogantly thrusting on him my Confession ; but, as he labours under the misfortune of having been understood on certain definite points to contradict the Articles, I solicit an explanation *on those points* in order that I may be able to satisfy those, and they are many, who desire satisfaction, and who do conscientiously need it.

It would be far better to *talk* over this matter, for I must write far too hastily ; and if my carriage could bring you out

[8] See *ante*, page 467 ; *post*, page 506.

for an hour to-morrow, it should come in for this purpose at any time you would name; but, failing this, will you let me in reply to your remarks add a few words of explanation on the paper I sent you containing the set of passages objected to.

I. I do not, of course, think that Dr. Hampden could say he would alter any of those passages to please others, or opponents, or the like; *but* if, *as I believe*, after a close study of his meaning, he does *not* mean to contradict the assertions of our Articles which he is supposed to contradict, he then might say, 'I will so word my future edition as to make it plain that I have no such meaning.' Perhaps this will be plainer if I very briefly explain it in detail.

II. Dr. Hampden has been supposed to teach that we have no reason to believe the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity to be true as to God, or eternal Truth, but only that it is a representation *for us*. I believe Dr. Hampden to mean no such thing. I believe him to show how the earthly ideas of Substance, Number, &c., came into the Trinitarian terminology, how from them as if parts of the auto-truths subtle men drew deductions, &c. Now this last is a valuable inquiry; the former would be formally condemned Sabellianism. Surely he might, without compromise of dignity, truth, or anything, say,—'Having been misunderstood to mean, &c. the former, when I did mean the latter, I will endeavour in a reprint to guard against this misunderstanding.'

So of III. Dr. H., I believe, means to contend that you are not to regard the language of Scripture as so dogmatically true that you may from the words extract or deduce consequences which shall be certainly true. He has been understood to say that a proposition capable of *certain and true proof by Scripture* is not necessarily true, and especially that St. Paul uses rhetorical flourishes, the chaff to the wheat, and therefore that, least of all, is *he* so to be trusted.

Surely Dr. Hampden might say, 'Having intended to point out the evil of the first and never meant to deny the second, I will strive, now the special matter is pointed out to me, to guard my language from such misconstruction.'

So of II. (forgive this transposition) *I* understood Dr. Hampden to say creeds, while they desire to keep out error,

and so are needful, are often themselves a lesser evil by limiting the illimitable. He has been understood as simply decrying our formularies.

IV. I understand Dr. Hampden to mean that we must not introduce our carnal reasonings into the awful mysteries of the Atonement, and attribute *μετάνοια* to God. He has been understood with the Socinians to deny *atonement* as the eternally foreseen plan or means of salvation, and to say with the Socinians that it only means a *proof to us* that God can forgive us—a sort of scenic representation of our conviction. Surely here he might easily say that he would clear his language from a misapprehension which I understand him to repudiate.

V. I understand Dr. Hampden to deny the *physical* degradation, or the depravation of the *carnal* nature of man, as it stands opposed to the *whole* nature of man—a subtle speculation, perhaps needful to put away a leaven of Manichæism. But he is understood to sympathise with the Pelagians, and deny the corruption of infants. Will he say that he will strive to clear his language of this mistake?

VI. I understand Dr. Hampden to deny the semi-material notions of inworking grace which have spread from *language* being treated so as to *yield ideas*. He is understood to deny the *reality* of the spiritual working of God's grace in us. Will he not state that he will try to cast out this gross misconception of his meaning?

VII. He is understood to deny that Sacraments derive their force from being by Christ's appointment outward signs by which He works spiritually in the worthy receiver. I believe him merely to deny the magical acting of the physical part of the Sacrament on the physical part of man. Surely he might in three words say that he did not intend the former denial, and that he will seek to clear his language from liability to this misconstruction?

Now, my dear Provost, I press for all this, not as wishing to dictate new Confessions, or to assume superiority to Dr. Hampden, or with any other arrogant thought whatever, but simply for this reason: however Dr. Hampden may have persuaded himself that all this is a mere persecution got up

against him for party purposes by Tractarians, *this is not the case.* The Tractarians may be, for many reasons, leaders in all attacks on him; but misunderstanding of his meaning, fears, doubts, and suspicions are shared by thousands who have never had any Tractarian bias. Need I mention names? I have had addresses last week with the names of E. M. Goulburn and C. P. Golightly to them, and of others who go beyond both of them, on the 'Protestant' side. Now, Dr. Hampden *may* refuse all satisfaction, may by political power overcome all opposition at Bow Church, may be consecrated and enthroned, and he may by this have achieved a triumph of political power; but will it not be more for his own peace, for the Church's peace, for his own usefulness in his diocese and in the Church, if by condescending (if he will take it so) to other men's weakness, becoming all things to all men, explaining even what ought not to need explanation, he can remove these suspicions, and not by a triumph of power, but with the hearty consent of good men of all moderate parties, reach his high station. I do not think his letter to Lord John alone makes this possible. It is too full of invective, too determined to see every man who doubts about his writings as a 'Tractarian opponent.' There is this one remaining opportunity—as Rector of Ewelme he *may* stoop to render a friendly explanation of his detailed purposes to his Diocesan. From my soul I wish that Diocesan were any one but me. But so it is. And I believe that holding that post of Diocesan does enable me, unworthy as I am, to offer him this opportunity, and to ensure him, not by my influence, but simply as the full result of his own explanation, a larger room for serving his Lord than he can otherwise attain.

You will kindly pardon the length to which I have been obliged to run on. I could not in fewer words explain WHY a detailed statement of alteration on certain points seems to me needful, and how it might be given without conceding one truth in the 'Bampton Lectures.' I am ever most truly your's, my dear Provost, in all affection,

S. OXON.

The next morning Bishop Wilberforce had an in-

terview with the Provost, who immediately saw Dr. Hampden, with what result the following letter, written the same evening, relates :—

The Provost of Oriel to the Bishop of Oxford.

Oriel College, Dec. 27, 1847.

My dear Lord,—I had a long interview with Dr. Hampden, but, I am sorry to say, without success.

In fact, the result was simply what I told your lordship this morning; he had taken legal advice, and acting under it he could no longer say anything or answer any questions.

There was no intended incivility, I believe, in his not having answered your lordship's letters. He had understood from the second (that, I mean, which followed the letter which you desired to withdraw) that it would be followed by another. But when I represented that the papers I had received from your lordship *were in fact* the communication which you had intended to make, he was still prevented by the legal advice he had received from reading or considering them. The fact that the Letters of Request were withdrawn did not affect his determination, nor would it induce him to consult his lawyers again.

Even the facts to which I adverted in my conversations with your lordship I have no permission to repeat *as from him;* I mean as to the 'Observations,' and his wish to improve the 'Bampton Lectures.'

But the fact as to the editions of the 'Observations' you may ascertain at once at Parker's shop. You will find, I believe, that he had about 50 copies of the first edition remaining when the second edition came out, that the book was his (Mr. Parker's) property, and he [Mr. P.] considered himself at liberty to sell them now to meet the new demand (the second edition having been long out of print), and that there are only some six or seven copies now remaining.

And as to Dr. Hampden's intention to amend his Lectures, I have again to regret, as in 1836, that he is under attack, or supposes himself to have been attacked, and therefore, by his

lawyer's advice, will *say* nothing. Yet I do not myself doubt that if he has the opportunity he really will desire to reprint his work, avoiding offence.

I am very sorry for all this, but I see no remedy. And yet you must not greatly blame Dr. Hampden for it. He is, I believe, of a gentle as well as a retired nature, but he resists what he supposes to be attacks. And most persons, when they had resorted to legal advice, would think themselves bound to act as they were directed.

I can only hope that many men who have mistrusted him will be led, like your lordship, to study his Lectures with real care and candour, and if they find, as you have done (and I know others of real knowledge and ability who have done the same), that most, if not all, of those passages which seem at first sight the most objectionable, really do admit of fair explanation—they will allow their opinion to be made known. Ever, my dear Lord, your's most sincerely,

EDW^{D} HAWKINS.

P.S.—I found, by the way, that Dr. H. knew nothing of the Article in the *Morning Chronicle*, and had given no authority to any one to publish your lordship's letters or say anything about them, but, considering them to be all parts of one transaction, he had shown them to several persons. I have more than once regretted the forwardness of some of his friends to make everything public.

On receiving this letter, the Bishop, the very next day, wrote at length to Dr. Hampden, announcing his final resolution in the matter, the reasons on which it was based, and the steps by which it had been reached.

The Bishop of Oxford to Professor Hampden.

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 28, 1847.

Reverend and dear Sir,—What has passed recently between us obliges me to mark in some detail the steps by which I have reached the conclusion which I desire to lay before you. And since, under the advice of your legal direc-

tors, you are led to decline all further communication on the subject, I am further compelled to address you thus publicly.

You are aware that when your nomination to the See of Hereford was first announced by common rumour, I thought it my painful duty to represent to the head of Her Majesty's Government the inconvenience which, in my judgment, would arise from the completion of the rumoured appointment. This representation was grounded on the censure of the University of Oxford, and on the wide prevalence of a strong opinion on the unsoundness of some of your published writings. It did not assume the justice of this opinion. My desire, and that I believe of others, was, that an opportunity should be afforded you of publicly refuting these charges before your nomination to the office of a Bishop. The representation, however, produced no such effect, and the apprehension and alarm which had been foreseen by those who signed it were speedily displayed. As one of their consequences, addresses, numerously signed, were presented by the clergy and laity to the Archbishop and Bishops, praying that all legal steps might be taken to prevent your consecration until the matter alleged against you had been brought to solemn decision. But in my own case more was done. As Rector of the Rectory of Ewelme, in this diocese, you were placed under my jurisdiction. This, it was thought, afforded an opportunity for obtaining an adjudication on the question under the provisions of the Clergy Discipline Bill. I was accordingly addressed by several of my clergy with the request that I would employ this machinery to obtain such a trial by sending a charge against the soundness of your teaching to the Court of Arches. I at once declined to promote such a suit. I was then requested—by performing the needful ministerial act of granting the Letters of Request to them—to allow other parties to promote such a suit. Such an inquiry I did not think it right to prevent by the interposition of a mere official *veto;* I signed accordingly the necessary document, informing you in a letter dated Dec. 16, that I had done so.

At this stage of the business it was suggested to me by the promoters, that, the matter being now in legal train, it was possible you might be willing to render to my private sug-

gestion, as Bishop of the diocese, the satisfaction which would otherwise be sought by a more painful process, through the Court of Arches. I gladly adopted the suggestion; and, desiring the promoters to suspend all further legal action till I had communicated with you, I wrote to you a second letter in which I stated, in detail, the points of doctrine which it was alleged in the 'Articles' laid before me, your writings had impugned, and asked you whether you would affirm your full belief in them. And, secondly, I asked whether you would be willing to withdraw the 'Observations on Dissent' and the 'Bampton Lectures,' not as admitting their language to be unsound, but for the peace of the Church, and because, in my judgment, as your Bishop, and in that of others, they did contain unsound language. Had you felt at liberty to reply fully to my questions and to consent to my suggestions, you would have given full satisfaction as well to the promoters of the suit as to me.

In your letter, dated December 10, giving full credit to the motives which led me to address you, you answer my first question thus: 'In perfect respect to you as Bishop of the diocese, and for your personal satisfaction, I unhesitatingly reply in the affirmative. I say Yes, to all your queries on my belief—in that sense in which they are the plain natural sense of the statements of our Articles and Formularies.' So far your answer was of course entirely satisfactory. To my *request* you gave no answer; and this silence I understood as tantamount to a refusal to withdraw the works in question; and, satisfactory as I thought that your declaration of personal faith ought to be to all, I deemed it to be impossible for me to require the promoters of the suit to relinquish it while there remained, unwithdrawn and unexplained, language which appeared to me so dangerous as that which was contained, more especially in your 'Observations on Dissent' (first edition), which was then on sale in Oxford; I therefore wrote to you to say that, as the language which seemed to me unsound was not to be withdrawn, I could not require the promoters to abandon their suit. But, immediately after writing thus, I learned from a letter of yours to a common friend, that it was with 'no sanction of yours, and indeed *against your wish*, that

any copies of the first edition of the "Observations on Religious Dissent" were now sold; and that even of the second edition *you* had put forth no copies since its publication.'

This entirely altered my view of the case, and I at once wrote to you requesting you to allow me to withdraw my last letter, because it closed a correspondence from which if kept open I now hoped much.

I had now before me as Bishop of the diocese:

1st. Your unqualified declaration of faith on the very points selected by the promoters of the suit as those supposed to be unsoundly treated.

2nd. The virtual withdrawal of what I deemed especially unsound.

There remained only the withdrawal of the 'Bampton Lectures' to fulfil every condition at first desired for my own or the promoters' satisfaction.

At this time I received your published letter to Lord John Russell, in which, to other explanations, you add the important admission: 'I should be much concerned if, from any unskilfulness in the use of words, I should have given rise to misapprehensions. I would not assert, however, that I have always succeeded in conveying my thoughts exactly.'

This admission appeared to me the more important, because at the same time I learned from the common friend, to whom I have already referred, that you had expressed to him a readiness to remove, in any reprint of the 'Bampton Lectures,' any incautious or obscure language which might have given rise to the impression that they contained unsound doctrines which you had not intended to put forth. Had I been able to obtain from you a direct statement that such alterations should be made in passages which I was ready to point out to you, full satisfaction would have been afforded to those who objected to your consecration: but, to my great regret, I learned that you were now acting under legal direction, and did not think yourself at liberty to answer, or even to receive any such proposals. This I deeply regretted, because I am well persuaded that by such explanations and assurances as you could most honestly and easily give, the anxious fears of numbers now disturbed within the Church might be at once

allayed, and without such direct assurances some, I fear, will remain unsatisfied. Then, in fact, the promoters of the suit now expressed to me their wish for its continuance. With this wish I could not comply for two reasons: first, because I believed that I substantially possessed already the explanations and assurances desired, and I felt that what the Church needed was, not the assertion of a point of honour, but a real security for the soundness of your doctrine; and, secondly, because I believed that to allow now the suit to proceed would imply a far more direct judicial assent on my part to its fitness than I had given in the first signing of the Letters of Request; for since I had performed that act my position had undergone an entire alteration. I thought at first that the Church had a right to some assurance of the soundness of your doctrines before your consecration as a Bishop; and, when no other way of obtaining that satisfaction appeared to be open, I did not even shrink, at the request of my clergy, from relegating the question to the Court of Arches. Since, at the suggestion of the promoters, and by your consenting to reply to my *quasi*-judicial questions, I had been led myself, as Bishop of the diocese, to assume the office of Judge in the cause. I could, therefore, no longer act merely ministerially in issuing Letters of Request. Both parties had to a great extent committed the matter to my judgment, and now, unless I was satisfied that there was matter for a criminal suit, I could not think myself justified in sending an accusation against you to be tried in the Arches Court. Whether there was such matter could be determined by me only after a careful study of the works in question, with all your explanations in my mind.

Regarding, then, the 'Observations on Dissent' as virtually withdrawn, I accordingly applied myself to a thorough and impartial examination of the 'Bampton Lectures.' I have now carefully studied them throughout, with the aid of those explanations of their meaning which you have furnished to the public since their first publication, and now in your private communications. The result of this examination, I am bound plainly to declare, is my own conviction that they do not justly warrant those suspicions of unsoundness to which

they have given rise, and which, so long as I trusted to selected extracts, I myself shared. For these suspicions of your meaning, and for the consequent distrust of the University, I must with equal frankness say that I discern the cause (whilst your works remained unexplained and the minds of men unassured by your full profession of the faith) in what appears to me a not unfrequent overstatement of favourite views and much obscurity of diction, resulting often from the arbitrary use of such words as 'facts,' 'doctrines,' 'proved,' 'deduced,' &c., and hence I believe it happened that men of such various parties in the Church concurred not unnaturally in the expression of a painful distrust of your meaning. But, allowing for these as the blemishes of what was, I believe, a necessarily hasty composition, and taking into account, as I now can, your various explanations and assurances, I find in the 'Lectures' little which will not admit of a favourable construction. And if at times I long for the manifestation of a more evidently reverential spirit in the discussion of the highest mysteries of our faith, I yet read in them a thoughtful and able history of the formation of dogmatic terminology, not a studied depreciation of authorized dogmatic language, still less any conscious denial of admitted dogmatic truth. I see in them, in fact, so far, little more than what has been already expressed in the words (never, I believe, considered liable to censure) of one of the ablest of your opponents in 1834, who says: 'If I avow my belief that freedom from symbols and articles is abstractedly the highest state of Church communion and the peculiar knowledge of the primitive Church, it is . . . first, because technicality and formality are, in their degree, inevitable results of public confessions of faith.' And again: 'Her rulers were loath to confess that the Church had grown too old to enjoy the free unsuspicious teaching with which her childhood was blest, and that her disciples must for the future calculate and reason before they acted.'—Newman's 'Arians,' pp. 41, 42.

Having reached, then, this conclusion, through the close study of your work and explanations, which the due discharge of the office of a judge required from me, I deem it my duty not

only to be satisfied with the assurance I possess of your future revision of the work, and to withdraw, therefore, the Letters of Request, but also, with whatever force the previous desire of explanation, and my position as Bishop of this diocese, may give to my words, to entreat those who have given utterance to their natural alarm at your appointment to weigh well the expression of my deliberate opinion, that you have given such explanations of what you personally believe on the points of suspicion, and what you intended as your meaning, as may well suffice to quiet all just alarm at your consecration to the office of Bishop.—I am, my dear Sir, very faithfully your's,

S. OXON.

This letter was not written without previous consultation with the more influential of the remonstrant Bishops, who expressed a general concurrence in the draft of it submitted to them, but the Bishop of London, though anxious that the matter should drop, did not consider that Dr. Hampden had made sufficient satisfaction. One sentence in the Bishop of Oxford's letter to the Bishop of London is significant:—

'I may add that I have reason to believe that we could have got no more than this. The *confirmation* [*i.e.* at Bow Church] would not have been delayed by the suit being entered, since it is held that the Clergy Discipline Act bars all proceedings on the *persona* at Bow Church, and so before any judgment could have been pronounced Dr. Hampden would have been out of the judgment of the Court.'

Thus, then, so far as public and official action is concerned, closed the Bishop of Oxford's connection with this complicated controversy. It is easy to understand that the conclusion was not one to satisfy either the opponents, or the supporters, of Dr. Hampden. However fully the Bishop might have satisfied himself that no heretical doctrine was definitely taught in the 'Bampton Lectures,' it could hardly be maintained that

Dr. Hampden had himself given even the moderate measure of satisfaction which the Bishop's final letter strove to exhibit. His opponents considered Dr. Hampden's concessions inadequate. His supporters resented the Bishop's letter as representing the concessions to be greater than had been really made. Amid the strife of tongues, the essential point, that, namely, of the Bishop's having granted the Letters of Request under the idea that he had no power to refuse, and having only withdrawn them when he was legally advised to the contrary, was unheeded and disregarded. Keenly susceptible to the opinion of others, the misrepresentations of his action and his motives, freely current among opponents, were such as to wound him deeply; but the misconceptions of those who sympathised with him must have been far more bitter, and the amount of reproach to which he was subjected at the hands of his friends may be imagined from the following letter, which he received from the Bishop of Exeter, almost immediately on the publication of the final letter to Dr. Hampden:—

The Bishop of Exeter to the Bishop of Oxford.

Bishopstowe, Jan. 1, 1848.

My dear Lord,—The first letter which I write in the year which has now opened shall be to you, and the first words of this letter shall be an earnest and hearty prayer to God that you and I and all of us who have been or shall be placed by Him in the office, for which none of us is fit, of ruling in His Church, may, by the gift of His Holy Spirit, have a right judgment in all things!

Let me next show that I am, so far as sincerity can make me, worthy of the confidence you have testified in me in asking me to tell you whether I am satisfied in the delicate matter which has been lately before you, and which your now published 'Letter to Dr. Hampden' proclaims to the world.

I will then frankly avow at once that I never before read

a document so painful and so surprising to me—painful, by reason of the sincere friendship I have ever sought and shall ever seek to cultivate with you, as well as of my high respect for your talents ; and surprising, because of my experience of the manifestation of those talents on all former occasions, and of my utter inability to descry in this document anything like the judicial discretion which I should have anticipated in you beyond almost any other of my brethren.

I told you in my letter of yesterday that you appeared to me to have had no right to stop the promoters from prosecuting their suit. I think so still, and with firmer conviction after more mature deliberation. Now, if I am right, see in what a position your published letter to Dr. Hampden has placed the suit, its promoters, and yourself. You have withdrawn your Letters of Request ; therefore, if the suit be still existent, you have undertaken to judge in it yourself ; and, as a preparation for such exercise of your judicial authority, the world will be astounded by finding that (after 'the promoters had expressed to you their wish for a continuance of the suit') you have examined the case in your own library, without any of the forms which are at once the aid, the protection, and the restraint of him who sits in judgment, and have announced your conviction of the invalidity of that charge in the columns of a newspaper.

If the suit be still alive (as I fully believe it must be held to be), you cannot now preside over it as judge. You must send fresh Letters of Request to the Court of Arches, on the ground of your unwillingness or inability to judge ; after having thus proclaimed to all the world both your eagerness to judge and your entire confidence in your ability to do so.

But I may be mistaken in my construction of the Statute. It may give you the power to do what you have done—to determine absolutely, of your own mere will or on your own mere opinion, that the suit shall not be prosecuted. If this be the proper construction of the Statute, I shall deeply lament it, for it will give to us Bishops a much greater amount of power, and in consequence of responsibility, than I think safe for ourselves, much less wise in the law to entrust to any men.

Still, even so, I should myself deem it at once my wisdom

and my duty to forbear from acting on so very invidious and dangerous a power in any case whatever which I can contemplate, certainly in any which should have the slightest semblance of affinity to the one in which you have exercised it.

But supposing that you have indeed the power, and have testified a sound discretion in choosing to exercise that power in this case, I think the manner in which you have exercised it is not such as will satisfy judicious and dispassionate observers of the proceeding.

You set out with saying that you had thought it your painful duty, when the intention of the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford was a matter of rumour, 'to represent (with other Bishops) to the head of Her Majesty's Government *the inconveniences* which in your judgment would arise from the completion of the rumoured appointment.'

Now, if the document in which I read these words were one hastily composed, and sent out as an ordinary expression of the writer's sentiments, I should not stop to criticise words. But in this *judicial* document I cannot doubt that you weighed well the words you used, and that this marvellous expression of 'the inconveniences' on which you and the Remonstrant Bishops are thus supposed to have grounded their entirely unprecedented interference with the judgment of the advisers of the Crown was carefully and deliberately adopted.

Now, as one of the Remonstrant Bishops, I protest against the application of such a word, as the ground of our Remonstrance. When I concurred in it I did not deem, nor do I believe that any other of the Remonstrants deemed, I do not believe that you yourself then deemed, that it was an apprehension of 'an inconvenience' which arrayed us in an attitude, not of hostility, but of friendly, indeed, yet earnest expostulation against a grave and very dangerous act of Ministerial power. So far from it, you and I and eleven other Bishops united in 'respectfully but earnestly expressing to Lord J. Russell our conviction that if this appointment of Dr. Hampden be completed, there is the greatest danger both of the interruption of the peace of the Church, and of the disturbance of the confidence which it is most desirable that the clergy and laity of the Church should feel in every

exercise of the Royal Supremacy, especially as regards that very delicate and important particular, the nomination to vacant sees.' Were these matters considered by us, at that time, in our anxious discussion of the perils of the Church, which we anticipated from this appointment, as 'an inconvenience?' If any one of us, if even you, had so characterised it *then*, I know not whether even the gravity of a meeting of Bishops would have restrained us from some disrespectful indication of our astonishment.

But I will not dwell on particular words, much less criticise in detail the course of proceeding on your part, which your judicial letter has made public. There is only one point on which I would specially remark, because it appears to me to involve the fitness of the whole view of the case taken by you.

You deal with it as if the matter at issue were this, 'Does Dr. Hampden hold unsound opinions?' whereas the real, the only question, which I have ever thought worthy of attention with regard to the appointment of Dr. Hampden—that which was expressly dealt with by the Convocation of Oxford is this—is he, or is he not, worthy of confidence as an exponent of Christian truth? A man may be very unfit, and may have proved himself by his writings to be very unfit, to teach the doctrines of the Church, much more to judge, as a Bishop may be called on to judge, in cases brought before him, of the teaching of others, who yet is quite sound in his own belief, and not only subscribes, but also holds all the doctrines in our Articles, our Catechism, and all our Formularies. Could a man, for instance, who, like Dr. Hampden, has declared that, since 'all opinion, as such, is involuntary in its nature, it is only a fallacy to invest dissent in religion with the awe of the objects about which it is conversant'—could such a man be reasonably expected to enforce the use of the Athanasian Creed, and to defend, if it be necessary, the Church's wisdom and piety in adopting it, even though he may subscribe the eighth Article, and declare his own opinion (however consistently) to accord with that Article? Could such a man be relied upon to exercise, when the merits of the case might require it, against those who maintain tenets directly contrary to the fundamental truths of the Gospel, that Power of the

Keys which was given to the Church by its Divine Head, 'to invest all grave offences of dissent in religion, as well as of sinfulness in conduct, with the awe of the objects about which religion is conversant?'

Could he who holds that those who believe our Blessed Lord to be a mere man, and who hold the Holy Spirit to be a mere mode of expressing an action of God, are our brethren in Christ, provided that they admit the truth of the Bible—could he be relied upon to maintain and assert against gainsayers the doctrine of the Church (even though he may believe), that 'the visible Church is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance,' &c.?

But I will not go on. I am writing, as a friend to a friend, a letter of grief, not of controversy; and I hasten to conclude it with my sincere assurance that I am, and ever hope to be, my dear Lord, your faithfully attached friend and brother,

H. EXETER.

P.S.—You say, in your letter of the 30th ult°, that 'you of course commit no one but yourself.' That is very true. Would that your proceeding affected no one but yourself!

It is of course clear that the Bishop of Oxford was, in one point of view, strictly justified in limiting himself, for the time, to the one question which the Bishop of Exeter regarded as so much too narrow, since the Court of Arches as a legal tribunal could take cognisance only of overt acts, or of definite doctrinal statements. The Bishop's answer, however, was as follows:—

The Bishop of Oxford to the Bishop of Exeter.

(*Private.*)

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 8, 1848.

My dear Lord,—Certainly my 'Letter to Dr. Hampden' has failed of conveying what I meant it to convey. I meant it to state:

(1.) That I thought the Censure of the University justified by the 'Observations on Dissent,' and the obscurity and want of reverence, and over-statement of the Bampton 'Lectures,' *unexplained.*

(2.) That our opposition was justified by the evils sure to spring from such an appointment.

(3.) That there was *ground* enough to justify my issuing Letters of Request; but that,—

(4.) Having been led to examine, and being satisfied that there was not *legal* ground for a suit, the 'Observations' being withdrawn, and the Bampton Lectures being explained, I could not *justly* issue them, and did not think there was ground for further resistance. I can only account for my words seeming to mean more by my writing in some indignation at the unfairness of the extracts;—an unfairness I had pointed out to Newman in 1836.

In great haste, ever believe me your's most faithfully,

S. OXON.

It is noticeable, however, that before long he took an opportunity of visiting the writer personally at Bishopstowe. It remains that from his private correspondence a few letters be selected, in which he gives his own account of the feelings under which he acted, and under which he regarded the whole transaction.

The Bishop of Oxford to Archdeacon Wilberforce.

Cuddesdon, Dec. 29, 1847.

My dearest Brother,—Ever since the Ordination I have been ill with influenza, two whole days in bed, and worn out with Dr. Hampden. The *matter* has taken this *form* (to speak *Hampdenian*). A party of my clergy (really representing Keble, &c.) applied to me for Letters of Request against Dr. Hampden, to take him into the Court of Arches. I consented, not to promote the suit, but to relegate it ministerially to the Court: and so it went. Then the promoters suggested that I should try to bring Dr. Hampden to the same conclusion that the Court would; confessing his faith and with-

drawing the books. This led to a communication between Dr. Hampden and me, and some answers; and so I was drawn into the position of the judge. I was, at least, not fully satisfied: the promoters not at all: they wished to go on with the suit. I had now gone too far into it to act merely ministerially. I must satisfy myself if I could, *judicially*, send the cause to the Arches. This led me, as a judge, to go most carefully through the 'Bampton Lectures' and Hampden's explanations, word by word. I came to the conclusion that there was no heresy in them; that every article would fail; that Newman's 'Extracts' were most false—I hope not wickedly and intentionally so—that he meant none of the things charged to him, and often did mean the very opposite. Here was a fix: to be committed, and now convinced, as an honest man, that Hampden was entitled to his verdict. I could do nothing, of course, but act justly. I had yesterday dear Keble, C. Marriott, J. Mozley, Dr. Addams, &c., for 4 hours, to convince me. I gave the utmost scope to every argument, and am more sure than ever that the charges are untrue. I have done all I can, withdrawn the Letters of Request, and written Hampden a letter doing him justice, but pointing out that his own ambiguity led to the attack. I have given my opinion that he ought not further to be opposed. I suppose that 'Times,' 'Morning Post,' 'Guardian,' 'Christian Remembrancer,' 'English Churchman,' will come down on me as a hailstorm, and the others not like me, because of the Remonstrance. Nevertheless, I have acted honestly. I wish I had you to talk to. I have sent my letter to the 'Times.' I hope it will be in on Friday;[9] if so read it and send me your judgment. I hope Henry won't cut me. As to the ultimate issue, my decision makes no difference. I am assured that, incidentally, the Clergy Discipline Bill prevents the Vicar-General at Bow entertaining any complaints against the man's morals or belief. Hampden would have been confirmed and consecrated before the Arches Court could have got into play. I may tell you privately that the good old Archbishop wrote to urge me to let the suit drop. I have tried in my letter to fix Hampden to explanations, and I feel

[9] The letter was published in the *Times* on Friday, December 31, 1847.

sure that they are in the best terms that could be got. Again, in confidence, Salisbury, Ely, London, Lincoln, Manchester, all approve of my course, and will testify it. Write to me soon and tell me I am *not* a rascal. If your letter comes when the pelting is heavy it will be quite a refreshment. Christmas blessings to you all. I am very tired: the influenza and Keble got into my brain last night, and I did not sleep 5 minutes all night.—From your loving brother,

S. OXON.

The Bishop of Oxford to Archdeacon Wilberforce.

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 6, 1848.

My dearest Brother,— . . . As to Dr. Hampden, of course if I thought he did mean to deny that the Atonement made any difference, &c., or that there was *no* objective truth, &c., of course I should not have hesitated about sending him for trial. But I am quite convinced in my own judgment that he means nothing of the kind; and I feel sure that, if we went through the 'Bampton Lectures' together, you would agree with me in that. . . . It seems to me that this stir has shown *great* life in the Church and power of resistance. I feel sure that if Hampden had been a Socinian, or real heretic, or what not, we should have prevented his consecration. *Private.—The Government tottered as it was.* There is a great doubt whether the præmunire is in force *at all;* still more if it could be brought to bear if a Canonical objection was urged. But *here* we had all difficulties. To *you* I may say in confidence, that the Archbishop wrote to me to urge, on Church grounds, the dropping of the suit. *I* had a full conviction that, poor as the explanation is, it is the *best*, in this case, we shall get. We might have begun a suit, but it would not have stayed the confirmation.

I suppose that, to men of my mental constitution, abuse, and especially insinuations of dishonesty, are more exquisitely painful than almost any other trial, and therefore also more necessary. Only may God give me the blessing of this and every other chastisement! *Private.*—I believe myself to have given up all that men call worldly promotion when I signed the Remonstrance against Hampden; and now, I fear, many

suppose me, when I was afraid of acting unjustly, to have acted from low cunning or cowardice. Your greatly loving brother,

S. OXON.

The following letter to Miss L. Noel repeats much of what was said in the letter to Archdeacon Wilberforce; but it is thought best to give it in full, as it shows how the Bishop told the same story to different correspondents:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Cuddesdon Palace, Dec. 29, 1847.

My dearest Sister,— . . . I *really* have been, from being unwell and overdone, quite incapable of writing to you; and all yesterday had that 'hunted hare' feeling of which my dear father used to speak: but I was at my desk from 11 till 8, and I *hope* have finished my work with Dr. Hampden. I forget how much I have told you. I think you saw my letter to Lord John, and his answer. Then I consented at the request of several of my clergy to allow a suit to be sent by me to the Arches Court for false doctrine. In this I acted *ministerially; i.e.* I pronounced no opinion as to whether there was or was not enough ground for the suit, but said the parties claiming it advance enough reason for it in the general report of his unsoundness, and their own intention of carrying it on; they being respectable people. I then wrote to Dr. Hampden to say I had instituted a suit. Next day 'the promoters' (really Keble, Pusey, C. Marriott, Mozley, *plus* a large body of my own clergy, but, responsibly, to me, the only parties, W. H. Ridley, T. Stevens, E. Deane, and W. Young, all beneficed clergy in the diocese) suggested to me that now probably Dr. H. would give me privately the satisfaction the Court would require. I agreed to try, and worked hard with them to prepare the terms. These were: 1st, 11 Articles of Faith he was supposed to have impugned, to be affirmed; 2ndly, an agreement to *withdraw* the 'Bampton Lectures' and 'Observations on Dissent' (these last far the worst), under a protest that he did not allow their unsoundness. He replied (not

pleasantly, it is not his habit) by a strong affirmation of his faith on the points inquired; and saying nothing about the books. I wrote to Lord John when I wrote to Hampden, and pointed out the advantage of H. giving this satisfaction; and I had a poor pettish letter from Lord John (how very much he has got round to be looked at, at the little end of the telescope; how soon pluck in some people turns into pertness!). But now I was *engaged with* Hampden, I thought the *mere* declaration of faith insufficient ground for my requiring the promoters to give up the suit, and wrote to Hampden to say so. But that very day I learned, in a letter from him to the Provost of Oriel,[1] that *virtually* he had withdrawn the 'Observations.' I then tried to reopen the communication, and the promoters agreed that if as to the 'Bampton Lectures' he would agree to *alter* in a future edition the language as to eight Articles so as not to *appear* heretical, they would withdraw the suit. In reply, I learned that his lawyers would not allow him to give any engagement, but also he expressed (again to the Provost) a readiness to alter and improve the 'Bampton Lectures.' The promoters then said, 'This is not enough. We wish to proceed.' But I was now in another position. They and he to a great measure had remitted the matter to my decision as Bishop. I could no longer act *merely* ministerially. I must *now* say '*I* think there is cause for a suit.' I replied then to them, that I must for myself read through, as judge, all the 'Bampton Lectures,' *explanations*, &c., and decide if I saw cause for proceeding. I did this; and to my extreme surprise became convinced that Newman's extracts, &c., were *most* unfair—so unfair as scarcely to let one hope they were not consciously unfair; that the 'Bampton Lectures' contained a good deal that was disagreeable, a great deal that was obscure, and nothing that was heretical, and that, coupled with the explanations I had, I saw *no ground* for resisting the appointment. As an honest man I must act on my convictions. I told the promoters so. Keble, Mozley, C. Marriott, and Dr. Addams their counsel, came here and spent 4 hours in talking over the matter in a friendly spirit; but they could urge nothing but the disappointment, &c. &c.

[1] See *ante*, page 467.

(in short the *pelting* I should have). I said, 'Show me *one* heretical proposition in the book; give me reason for *justly* saying Dr. Hampden shall be tried, and I will go on to the utmost with it; but God has made me Bishop to do justice on my own convictions. I have taken the *utmost* pains to make up my mind. I must act on its decisions. I wished you to come that I might hear and weigh your views,' &c. It ended in my withdrawing the suit. I have now written to Dr. H. detailing his *explanations* to hold him to them, stating 'the course of events and my own judgment, and urging on *opponents* to weigh it well.' This I have sent to the 'Times' newspaper. Of course the extreme people will abuse me; but I hope the mass of more moderate men will be quieted by it, and it will be on the whole the best solution for the Church. Enough has been done, I think, to show that a Minister could not force a plainly heretical bishop on the Church, and *justly* I do not believe Dr. Hampden can be stopped. I believe that I have with me the Bishops of London, Lincoln, Ely, Salisbury, Winchester. Probably Exeter and Chichester will be dissatisfied.

To some inquiries from his friend, Professor Walker, he replied thus:—

The Bishop of Oxford to Rev. Professor Walker.

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 25, 1848.

My dear Walker,—You mentioned to me in conversation that some persons of high character had heard it suggested that my dissuading further opposition to Dr. Hampden's consecration had resulted from an intimation of the Queen's wishes, and giving some credence to it, I at the moment replied with some indignation to so unworthy a surmise, and said no more. But, reflecting since on it, it seems to me most in the spirit of St. Paul's injunctions to put a force upon myself and answer more distinctly such a whisper. For though to anonymous public slanderers I would give no answer, yet to a stumbled Christian friend I ought even to humble myself to reply to a surmise so degrading to my character even as this. I therefore authorise you explicitly to declare that I have never had, directly or indirectly, the

slightest intimation of the Queen's wishes or feelings on the subject. I took my line at first directly and openly against the stream of Royal influence on a sense of duty. I never swerved from it. I should have maintained the suit if I could have done so *justly*. The Provost of Oriel can tell you that on the day after the Ordination, in answer to his questions, I told him that I had not obtained sufficient satisfaction from Dr. Hampden, and *that the suit must go on;* that *he* then told me of the *legal*, and I thought moral, disavowal of the 'Observations on Dissent' by Dr. Hampden; that he obtained this in Dr. Hampden's handwriting; and, that as this work had been the ground on which I relied, I at once, on receiving this assurance, stayed matters till I had carefully examined Dr. Hampden's other writings *with the explanations* (for these, and not the 'Bampton Lectures,' were new to me, not having voted in 1842, and so not required to read them); and being satisfied that they *without the 'Observations'* would not support a suit, I dismissed it, and urged the cessation of a resistance which I thought could no longer be legally made. *I* have changed no opinion I ever held on the subject. I still think that the 'Observations' would be *condemned* by a Court. I think the University Censure just, the Bishops' representation right, the Church's resistance righteous. I only thought it *unjust*, and therefore *wrong*, to continue a criminal suit when there was not legal ground to maintain it, and that if there was not legal ground the opposition should cease, and we make the most of such admissions as we had; for that the opposition would cease to be right when it could no longer be legally supported. From the Provost of Oriel and from those most opposed to Dr. Hampden whom I saw, you could alike have confirmation of all this. And what I did I did with the general concurrence and agreement of at least 5 of the Bishops who had joined the Remonstrance. I am, my dear Walker, ever your's very truly,

S. OXON.

To print additional letters of this kind necessarily involves some repetition, but there are some special features in one which he addressed to the Rev. E.

Bickersteth, Rector of Walton, which seem to demand its insertion :—

The Bishop of Oxford to Rev. E. Bickersteth.

Cuddesdon Palace, Jan. 1848.

My dear Sir,—I will not let a post pass without replying to your friendly note. It expresses *very nearly* my view on the matter.

In 1836 I voted with others for the vote of suspicion, *mainly* from my view of the 'Observations on Dissent,' which seemed to me, as they still do, to assert that all religious opinion is involuntary, and Socinianism little different from Christianity. In 1836 I remonstrated with Mr. Newman on the unfairness of some of his extracts, but was satisfied that there *was* ground for expressed suspicion. In 1842 I began a careful study of the question, feeling that what had since passed had revived it, but being taken ill I could not go to Oxford, and dropped the matter.

When the subject of a *representation* to Lord John was discussed I felt a strong opinion, first on Dr. Hampden's unfitness (for many reasons) for the office; and, secondly, I felt that his appointment, under the censure of the University, was *pessimi exempli.* I therefore resolved to sign—with my eyes open to what might be the effects to me personally of taking this step:—but I thought it *right.* I would not declare his *unsoundness;* but I may say to you privately that I wrote to Lord John to press *enquiry* and explanation as what the Church required.

Matters going on, I was asked to *allow* a prosecution on the score of unsoundness, and consented. Then followed my demand of explanation, and up to a certain point the explanation being given, I had then to weigh whether it was *enough.* I found the 'Observations,' *my* strong point, *withdrawn* (both first *and second* editions) and the Bampton Lectures *explained.* I was convinced that there was not ground for a criminal suit, and, much as I wished for an authoritative judgment, I did not feel that I (believing that there was *not* ground) could say to the Judge of the Arches Court that

there *was* ground for a *criminal* information, and it was only in this way that I could proceed. I therefore felt bound in *justice* to drop the suit. I felt, further, that, if the suit was dropped, there was not sufficient ground for the Church to persevere in her resistance to Dr. Hampden's consecration, and for peace' sake I said so. I did *not* say that I thought the censure of the University had been wrong; I pointed to the over-statements, ambiguity, and want of reverence in the 'Bampton Lectures,' and to the unsoundness of the 'Observations' as justifying it. I did *not* say the Bishops' representation had been wrong; I think it was in the main right, and that all subsequent trouble might have been stayed if Lord John had received it rightly. I *did* say what justice and the fear of God seemed to me to require, that with the 'Observations' withdrawn and the 'Lectures' explained, I thought no more opposition need be made. I was *sure* to please no *party*. But I thought it *just* to Dr. Hampden and *best* for the Church to say so. I see that my 'Letter' might much more perfectly have expressed my meaning, but I still think it was right to dismiss this suit, which was the great question.

Now surely those who must have influence with such papers as the 'Record' ought to bring their influence to bear, at such times, to procure *Justice*. What mean the insulting epithets of 'courtly,' and such like? Anything contrary to Christian honesty is equally bad at Court or away from Court: and if God were pleased, as I believe for my sainted father's sake, to give to one so unworthy his Sovereign's favour, surely that gift alone, unless it be misused, is not a warrant for the abuse of Christians. Pardon my saying thus much. For I do deeply feel what you say. Such checks may be—it has been my prayer many times a day for this last week that to me it may be—an especial blessing. If I have been content to risk the favour of my Sovereign, to do what a jealous care for the truth of Christ seemed to me at first to require; if I have since been ready to meet the hostility of so able and warm a party as the Tractarians, to do justice; and if I meet for it with nothing but insulting sneers and obloquy, I do feel that it is not worth a sigh if it be *His* means of answering my daily prayer, that He would teach

me to love Him better, and more simply to follow Him Who died for me. And if at times I can realise His 'Blessed are ye when men shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for My sake,'—it is enough to turn all these sharp stings of natural pain at men's misrepresentations into joy itself. Pardon me that I have so run on, and believe me to be your's, &c.

S. OXON.

Compare the intense feeling which burns in the concluding sentences of this letter with that shown in the extracts already cited[2] from his private diary, and who can doubt that in the trial and fiery agony of those weeks Bishop Wilberforce underwent a spiritual and an intellectual *annealing* from which he came out stronger and greater than before. The word agony is far from being too strong for the occasion. He had aimed high. He had aimed at a great object. That object, one and the same throughout, he had, by different methods and by changing means, pursued with a persistent tenacity of which none but a strong nature was capable. In so doing he had been driven onward by the strong consciousness of right and duty. To the external view of the purely secular politician the matter seemed, no doubt, a very ordinary one, in fact, merely such a struggle for power as happens every day in the political arena. It was not so with those whose cause Bishop Wilberforce had championed, and to whose opinion he was most keenly sensitive. Bishop Wilberforce knew well that it was one which moved to the uttermost the hearts and consciences of thousands whose judgment on his conduct would be absolutely sincere, even though he might know that in certain particulars it must be mistaken through imperfect information. To lie under the misunderstanding of such

[2] See *ante*, page 184, par. 4, § *c*.

men was, to him, the keenest agony ; and yet not even for their approbation would he consent to what he regarded as wrong. It is trials such as this which raise the moral courage of the upright to its full stature ; and which finally destroy the self-regard of the conscientious. It is disappointments such as these which clear the intellectual judgment of the public man from the disturbance arising from the mingling of personal interest with public motive. The cup of domestic happiness had been dashed from Bishop Wilberforce's hands years before ; and now a second blow fell upon him which, in its results upon his character, could hardly have been less influential. As a great ecclesiastical governor, self-forgetful, clear-sighted, and decisive as to what was best for the general good, Bishop Wilberforce became unrivalled, and it is not improbable that the many lessons of this sharp grief may have contributed not a little to the result.

It can excite no surprise that, surrounded as the Bishop was during the next few weeks with various and conflicting criticisms of his conduct, he contemplated putting forward a public statement of the grounds on which the foregoing pages have shown him to have acted. This statement he drew up in the form of a 'Letter to a Friend,' and submitted it in manuscript to the judgment of several of his acquaintance. Among others it was shown to Sir Robert Peel, whose reply is subjoined :—

Sir Robert Peel to the Bishop of Oxford.

Drayton Manor, Jan. 25, 1848.

My dear Lord Bishop,—I have carefully read your published letter to Dr. Hampden and the enclosed draft of a 'Letter to a Friend.'

My opinion is adverse to the publication of the latter document, because I think such a publication would imply,

or at least would be construed by the unfriendly to imply, a consciousness on your part of being in the wrong, and of the incompleteness of the reasons which you assigned in great detail for the course you had pursued in your published letter to Dr. Hampden. I do not see that this letter makes any material additions to the former.

In the heat of controversy you must expect much misstatement and much erroneous construction. You will contend to great disadvantage with anonymous assailants, and their future assaults will most likely be encouraged by the authorised notice of the past. When I was in London I was told (and the report came from Doctors' Commons) that you had incited the clergy of your diocese to promote the suit in the Court of Arches; and in evidence of this I was told also that you had attached your signature to the document (whatever it may be) which is the necessary preliminary to the suit *before* the signatures of those who were supposed to be the real promoters of it had been attached to it.

I said I was confident these reports were substantially erroneous. They were, in fact, contradicted by your published letter to Dr. Hampden—a letter which must be known to those of your clergy who had really promoted the suit, and with the views of whom (at least in a subsequent stage of the proceedings) you had not concurred.

After the publication of this draft, such erroneous statements may still be made; and, if you notice other erroneous statements, the omission to notice such and such like may, I will not say warrant, but will provoke unfavourable inferences.

You probably saw Dr. Hampden's [statement] in a postscript to a letter to (I think) Mr. Faulkner, on your published letter to him. The publication of this draft will very likely lead to fresh comments, and to a demand for the publication of all your letters to Dr. Hampden. The only importance of this is that it will either force you into an interminable newspaper controversy, or expose you to the unfavourable inferences which may be drawn from silence *after* you have set the example of publication.

Forbearance from publishing at present will not preclude you from vindicating yourself if avowed opponents demand

explanation in the place where you can best give it; namely, in your place in the House of Lords. The whole subject will probably undergo discussion there; and, if any vindication of your conduct be required, let it be demanded and given there. If there be complete silence, as to the course you have taken, in the House of Lords, the presumption must be that there is no necessity for explanation.

For these reasons I am adverse to the publication of this letter, the draft of which you have sent me. I am obliged to write in great haste, as I feel the importance of an immediate answer. Believe me, my dear Lord Bishop, most faithfully your's,

ROBERT PEEL.

The 'Letter to a Friend' was accordingly never published; but some slight controversy still lingered on with reference to the statement in Dr. Hampden's 'postscript to a letter to Mr. Faulkner,' above referred to by Sir R. Peel. The letter bore date January 7, 1848, and the postscript was as follows:—

The Bishop of Oxford would insinuate in his letter in the 'Times' that I have made concessions to him. I shall be obliged to you most positively to contradict any such statement, should you hear it alleged. It is not true.

The result was a full account in the 'Times' by Provost Hawkins, of what the reader already knows, respecting the communication made by him at the time of the Ordination[3] to the Bishop; and with this the Bishop of Oxford's connection with the controversy ends. For the rest it may suffice to record that every effort was made, at Bow Church, to resist the confirmation of the new Bishop's election;[4] but, though the usual form was gone through of summoning all who had

[3] See *ante*, pages 467, 476.

[4] The 'election' of the Bishop by the Chapter of Hereford Cathedral took place on December 28, 1847, fourteen voting for Dr. Hampden, and two against him; the Dean, Dr. Merewether, being one of the two. The Dean also entered a protest against the election.

objections to make, still, when objections were offered in answer to the summons, all hearing was refused to them. One question, indeed, the Court did suffer to be argued before it; but it was only the preliminary question whether it was competent to it to hear the opposers whom its own apparitor had summoned with the formal addition that such opposers should 'be heard.' The question was argued on January 11, before the Archbishop's Vicar-General, Dr. Burnaby, supported by Sir John Dodson and Dr. Lushington as assessors; the claim of the opposers to be heard was set aside, and the confirmation was completed. The question, however, was not yet quite set at rest. On January 14 an application was made to the Court of Queen's Bench for a *mandamus* compelling the Archbishop to hear the opposers and their objections. The case was argued before four Judges—Coleridge, Denman, Erle, and Patteson; and the decision was given on February 1. Coleridge and Patteson were for granting the *mandamus*, regarding the confirmation as a real judicial transaction; but Erle refused on the ground that it had reference not to the fitness of the person, but only to the validity of the election of the Bishop by the Chapter of the Cathedral of his future diocese. Lord Chief Justice Denman was also against granting the *mandamus;* so that the Bench was equally divided, and, therefore, by rule of law, the *mandamus* was not granted. The subject was brought before the House of Lords on the 15th, by the Bishop of Exeter, when Lord Denman defended the decision; but it was significant that he did not adopt the view put forward by Mr. Justice Erle. He took a simpler course, and declared that 'it was not to be supposed for a moment that the Crown would nominate, to the high position of a Bishop, an unfit person; and that the law would certainly be in a strange

state if it should require an Archbishop, before he proceeded to confirm or consecrate a party nominated by the Crown, to call upon all the world to throw scandal upon the nominee;' that the form 'preserved by the proclamation' was one which was a mere form, and 'had never been known to be used;' that, if otherwise, 'the prerogative of the Crown would be most seriously interfered with;' and, finally, he defended the judgment not on grounds of law or justice, but by warning his hearers of 'the fatal consequences of allowing objections to be made to the nominees of the Crown,' and declaring 'that by checking every attempt at [such] interference, the Church was protected from great danger and mischief.'

On February 11, four days before this debate, Archbishop Howley had died, being within one day only of the great age of eighty-two. On March 26 Dr. Hampden was consecrated in Lambeth Chapel, the Bishops of Norwich, Llandaff, and Worcester assisting the new Primate, Archbishop J. B. Sumner; the Bishops of London and Winchester having declined to take part in the consecration. For a short time a plan had been entertained of appealing to the House of Lords against the refusal of the *mandamus*, Sir Fitzroy Kelly, Dr. Addams, Dr. A. J. Stephens, and Mr. Badely, advising that course; but the project was never carried out. Meantime, the feeling on the part of the Church that Dr. Hampden owed his elevation, in some measure at least, to that advocacy of the cause of Dissent which had contributed to his unpopularity in Oxford, was not diminished by the fact that Dr. Graham, the Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, who, in 1834, had proposed to transfer the College prayers from the Chapel to the Hall, so as to meet the views of Dissenters, was nominated to the See of Chester,

vacated by the translation of Bishop J. B. Sumner to Canterbury.

The reader is now in a position to form his own judgment, both as to the part played by the Bishop of Oxford in this untoward affair, and as to the motives by which he was actuated. The fulness and the unreserve with which the materials for this judgment have been here set forth are due to two reasons mainly. First, because it was a real crisis in his career, and, therefore, has a special importance in any account of his life. Next, because his conduct was, and to a great extent has remained, largely misunderstood. Little need be said with respect to those who may be called his natural opponents, and who, in an age of party spirit, were almost sure to mistake his motives. But, in the case before us, even those who trusted him were puzzled by his rapid change of front, and felt their confidence shaken. It has, therefore, been thought due to his memory, even at the expense of some prolixity, not merely to give an authentic statement of the facts (which might have been done in short space), but to exhibit in full the conflicting forces which were at work upon the Bishop's mind from the first moment when he wrote to Miss L. Noel[5] of his feeling 'sick at heart' about the whole business, down to the private correspondence with Provost Hawkins, which immediately preceded his final 'Letter.' Perhaps the Bishop of Oxford was the one man who, in his heart as well as in his intellectual conviction, did full justice to both the contending parties. On the one hand, none knew better than he did how deep and genuine was the alarm of the great majority of the most conscientious members of the Church of England, both lay and clerical. On the other, it is clear that,

[5] See *ante*, Letter to Miss L. Noel, pages 445–6.

however ill-advised he considered both the appointment of Dr. Hampden and the language of his 'Bampton Lectures,' still he did not regard him as personally heretical. Doing justice himself to both sides, his desire was that public justice should be done to both, that the conscientious fears of the one should be respected and removed, and that Dr. Hampden himself should be rehabilitated and suspicions done away. Deeper motives even than these weighed largely with him. Fully as he believed in the divine and spiritual character of the Church, Bishop Wiberforce was equally convinced of the desirableness (to say no more) of maintaining intact its connection with the State; he felt keenly the danger to which that connection was exposed by a course so utterly unstatesmanlike as that taken by the Prime Minister; and he was intensely desirous that the matter should be settled in such a way as to leave that connection unharmed. This it was obvious could only be effected by securing justice —*visible* justice—to both sides; and thus every motive which could act upon Bishop Wilberforce's mind impelled him in the one direction which he took; and that direction, in spite of all that has been alleged, *was* one and the same throughout, *viz.* to obtain legitimate satisfaction for those who honestly doubted Dr. Hampden's orthodoxy, and to set Dr. Hampden himself right with the Church by some public attestation of it. Each of Bishop Wilberforce's three actions was taken with this one aim. It was with this aim that he wrote to Lord John on December 11, asking for a legitimate investigation into the matter. This was his first effort. Then, when this failed, it was with this aim that he consented to grant the Letters of Request when he was advised that by so doing he expressed no condemnation, of his own, of Dr. Hampden's orthodoxy. This

was his second step. The third step had precisely the same object, when, being advised that granting the Letters involved his own condemnation of Dr. Hampden, he could no longer grant them, and, *therefore*, sought to obtain from Dr. Hampden himself the same thing which he had previously sought by more formal measures. In all three cases the object was identical, and to accuse Bishop Wilberforce of tergiversation because he sought the same end by different means, as the circumstances varied, is as if a landsman were to charge a seaman with no longer steering for the same harbour because with a change of wind he alters his helm.

It is not impossible that different minds may form differing judgments as to the Bishop's wisdom or prudence in taking such strong action under such difficult circumstances. Perhaps it may be thought by some that a wiser course would have been to have done, or at least to have attempted, far less. But this is clear, that to have refrained from making every effort in his power to adjust matters would not have been a *natural* course for such a man as Samuel Wilberforce. More than once it has had to be remarked that he did not know what hesitation was when the office of peacemaker appeared even in the smallest degree to be set before him. It is a dangerous office even when the peacemaker has accurately gauged the character and the purpose of those with whom he is concerned. In the case before us, Bishop Wilberforce evidently made three grave miscalculations.

In the first place it is plain that he overrated the openness of Lord John Russell's mind to the arguments which he set before him in his letter of December 11, 1847. It was only on April 7 of the same year that the Bishop had written, 'I am sure that Lord

John Russell means honestly by the Church;'[6] and he scarcely seems to have doubted that reasons which he honestly regarded as conclusive would meet with full consideration from the Premier.

A second miscalculation lay in his conviction that Dr. Hampden himself was not averse to a judicial settlement of the controversy. In the letter to Miss L. Noel, of December 12, prior to the appearance of Dr. Hampden's 'Letter to Lord John Russell,' he wrote: 'I believe *he* [*i.e.* Lord John] means this, and I am expecting Dr. Hampden's "Letter to Lord John" to be a *prescribed asking*[7] for the opportunity of disproving charges;' after the publication of the 'Letter,' he expresses his disappointment at finding it to be otherwise.

Then, thirdly, the Bishop made the mistake of thinking that Dr. Hampden would understand the motive of his approaches to him, and that he would meet him halfway as seeking only to promote the Church's peace and the cause of equity. On the contrary, Dr. Hampden seems to have conceived of the Bishop as holding a brief for his opponents; and the Bishop's miscalculation resulted in Dr. Hampden's refusal, under legal advice, to hold further communications with him. Could Dr. Hampden have known the Bishop's course in those consultations at Cuddesdon, to which reference has been made, or could he have seen those open-hearted letters to Miss L. Noel, when the trouble was beginning, he might have appreciated the Bishop's motives more truly, and understood his conduct very differently. The sum of the whole matter would seem to be that the Bishop had striven to heal that

[6] See *ante*, page 446.

[7] See also the letter from the Bishop, dated December 12, to a clergyman who had been asked to become a promoter of the suit, page 451.

which could not be healed, and had failed to estimate the irreconcilable nature of the elements of the case before him.

So far as the legal aspect of the case was concerned, it ought to be remembered that the circumstances were extraordinary, and difficulties of various kinds beset the consideration of the case. The Statute (3 & 4 Victoria, c. 86) was a recent one; lawyers of eminence differed as to its construction; and that it was not easy to construe has been proved by the fact that since that time nearly every clause in it has undergone litigation, and often conflicting judicial decisions. By the provisions of this Statute an accused clerk might be tried in one of two ways:—(1) By the Bishop himself, aided by certain assessors, after Commissioners, on a preliminary inquiry, had reported that there was a *primâ facie* case. (2) By the Bishop's granting Letters of Request which removed the case, either before or after preliminary inquiry, entirely to the Provincial Court. When these had been accepted, the Bishop was *functus officio.*

The Bishop of Oxford seems to have granted Letters of Request under advice that he was discharging a purely ministerial office, and then to have retracted them, *before they were accepted*, under the contrary advice, *viz.* that in granting them he was discharging, to a certain extent, a judicial function, that, namely, of affirming the existence of a *primâ facie* case against Dr. Hampden, which, after the 'Observations on Religious Dissent' were removed from consideration, he could not do.

And here not only this chapter, but this volume might well close; but inasmuch as, while yet the last sounds of the strife had scarcely died away, the Bishop

was spending a few days in visiting Sir Robert Peel at Drayton Manor, and the Marquis of Northampton at Castle Ashby, from both of which houses letters were written from which extracts should be given, they are here added, instead of being reserved for the second volume. The letters were to Miss Noel, to whom he wrote from Drayton Manor first on January 12 :—

I have had a long private talk, and a satisfactory one, with Sir Robert as to *my* affairs, and I think he entirely sees through the hollowness of all the charges of insincerity which have been so falsely urged against me; and this is a comfort to me.

And again, the next day, January 13:—

The more I see of Sir R. the more I am convinced of his perfect honesty; but what an instance of the vanity of ambition in *his* being out of power, and the pert incompetence of Lord John Russell employed in mismanaging the affairs of the country.

And a few days afterwards from Castle Ashby :—

The Bishop of Oxford to Miss L. Noel.

Castle Ashby, Jan. 17, 1848.

Dearest Sister,—I have been wishing always to reply to your questions as to Sir Robert. I will try. He is very kind in his hospitality; and, when I talked with him alone, far more threw off the great Sir R. than I ever saw him do before; talked of his own being abused, motives imputed, &c., quite naturally. In his family he is *reserved and shy;* the air of a man conscious of great powers and slight awkwardnesses. It is more the reserve of a man thus drawn two ways than from the frigid contemplation of his own greatness. Then I think I saw him in some respects at a disadvantage from the great family anxiety hanging over him, and making it doubtful if he should be called away or we sent home at a moment's notice. He had at home Lady Villiers (his eldest daughter) and her lord; his next daughter

not fully out—a breakfaster and drawing-roomer, not a full diner—and a young man son. I did not happen to see him say much to either of these two last. To Lady Villiers his manners were always very pleasant, full of affection and a sort of fatherly courtesy. To the children (Villiers's) he was always kind, but rather *to be* kind than as sunning himself in childhood's smiles. He is rather decidedly deaf; and this again a little constrains him, lest he should speak of what is not being spoken of, or the like. In his picture-gallery and showing us round his draining operations he spoke freely, pleasantly, and readily. All he said smacked of that which he is most accused of wanting—honesty of purpose. I feel, myself, sure of his true honesty.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

ALBEMARLE STREET :

December 1879.

MR. MURRAY'S LIST.

LIFE OF CHARLES RICHARD SUMNER, D.D.

LATE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, DURING AN EPISCOPATE OF FORTY YEARS. By G. H. SUMNER, M.A., Rector of Old Alresford. With Portrait. 8vo. 14*s.*

MEMOIR OF ROBERT MILMAN, D.D.

BISHOP OF CALCUTTA AND METROPOLITAN OF INDIA. By his Sister, FRANCES MARIA MILMAN. With Map. 8vo. 12*s.*

MEMOIR OF EDWARD AND CATHERINE STANLEY.

By the DEAN of WESTMINSTER. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

LIFE OF THE RIGHT HON. WILLIAM PITT.

WITH EXTRACTS FROM HIS MS. PAPERS. By EARL STANHOPE. With Portraits. 3 vols. 8vo. 36*s.*

MEMOIRS OF SIR FOWELL BUXTON.

WITH EXTRACTS FROM HIS CORRESPONDENCE. By CHARLES BUXTON. With Portrait. 8vo. 16*s.*; or Popular Edition, 5*s.*

LIFE OF WILLIAM WILBERFORCE.

By the late Bishop WILBERFORCE. With Portrait. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

MEMOIR OF SIR RODERICK MURCHISON.

WITH NOTICES OF HIS CONTEMPORARIES. By Professor GEIKIE. With Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo. 30*s.*

PERSONAL LIFE OF GEORGE GROTE,

THE HISTORIAN OF GREECE. COMPILED FROM FAMILY DOCUMENTS, PRIVATE MEMORANDA, &c. By Mrs. GROTE. With Portrait, 8vo. 12*s.*

MEMOIR OF CAROLINE HERSCHEL,

SISTER OF SIR WILLIAM AND AUNT OF SIR JOHN HERSCHEL. By Mrs. JOHN HERSCHEL. With Portraits. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

[*Continued.*

PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS,

FROM EARLY LIFE TO OLD AGE, OF THE LATE MRS. SOMERVILLE. With Portrait. Crown 8vo. 12*s.*

LIFE AND TIMES OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

By Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, M.A. Portrait. 8vo.

LIFE OF DR. ARNOLD OF RUGBY.

By Dean STANLEY. With Portrait. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 10*s.*

LIFE OF JOHN WILSON, D.D., OF BOMBAY,

FIFTY YEARS PHILANTHROPIST AND SCHOLAR IN THE EAST.
By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D. With Portrait. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

THE SPEAKER'S COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE;

WITH AN EXPLANATORY AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY AND A REVISION OF THE TRANSLATION. By BISHOPS and CLERGY of the ANGLICAN CHURCH. Edited by F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter. Medium 8vo.

LIST OF WRITERS.

ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.	DEAN MANSEL.	REV. DR. CURREY.
BISHOP OF LONDON.	CANON COOK.	REV. J. M. FULLER.
BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.	CANON ESPIN.	PROFESSOR GANDELL.
BISHOP OF CHESTER.	CANON RAWLINSON.	REV. E. HUXTABLE.
BISHOP OF BATH & WELLS.	CANON WESTCOTT.	REV. DR. KAY.
BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.	ARCHDEACON LEE.	REV. T. KINGSBURY.
BISHOP OF DERRY.	ARCHDEACON ROSE.	REV. I. R. LUMBY.
DEAN OF CANTERBURY.	REV. C. J. ELLIOTT.	REV. F. MEYRICK.
DEAN OF WELLS.	REV. W. DRAKE.	REV. E. H. PLUMPTRE.
DEAN OF ROCHESTER.	REV. E. H. GIFFORD.	REV. J. F. THRUPP.
DEAN OF CHESTER.	REV. T. S. EVANS.	REV. J. WAITE.
DEAN JEREMIE.	REV. SAMUEL CLARK.	

I.—OLD TESTAMENT. Complete. 6 vols. £6. 15*s.*

II.—NEW TESTAMENT. (To be completed in 4 vols.) Vol. I. 18*s.* Vol. II. 20*s.*

III.—APOCRYPHA. [*In preparation.*

WORD, WORK, AND WILL.

COLLECTED PAPERS. By WM. THOMSON, D.D., Archbishop of York. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

CONTENTS.

Synoptic Gospels.	Worth of Life.	Emotions in Preaching.
Death of Christ.	Design in Nature.	Defects in Missionary Work.
God Exists.	Sports and Pastimes.	Limits of Philosophical Enquiry.

[*Continued.*

DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE;

ITS ANTIQUITIES, BIOGRAPHY, GEOGRAPHY, NATURAL HISTORY. Edited by WM. SMITH, D.C.L. & LL.D. With Illustrations. 3 vols. 8vo. 105*s.*

DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES;

THE HISTORY, INSTITUTIONS, AND ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH and Archdeacon CHEETHAM. With Illustrations. 2 vols. medium 8vo. Vol. I. 31*s.* 6*d.*, Vol. II. 42*s.*

This Work commences at the point at which the 'Dictionary of the Bible' leaves off, and gives an account of the Institutions of the Christian Church from the time of the Apostles to the age of Charlemagne.

DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY, LITERATURE, SECTS, AND DOCTRINES.

Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH and Professor WACE. (To be completed in 4 vols.) Medium 8vo. Vols. I. & II. 31*s.* 6*d.* each.

This Work is designed to give a comprehensive account of the Personal, the Literary, the Dogmatic, and the Ecclesiastical Life of the Church during the first eight centuries of Christianity, and, in combination with the 'Dictionary of Christian Antiquities,' it will afford, it is believed, the most complete collection of materials for the Church History of that period which has yet been published, either in England or abroad.

HISTORY OF THE JEWISH CHURCH.

FROM ABRAHAM TO THE CHRISTIAN ERA. By Dean STANLEY, D.D. With Plans. 3 vols. 8vo. 38*s.*

HISTORY OF THE EASTERN CHURCH.

By Dean STANLEY, D.D. With Maps. 8vo. 12*s.*

CONTENTS.

The Province, Study, and Advantages of Ecclesiastical History—The Eastern Church—Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325—The Emperor Constantine—Athanasius—Mahometanism and the Eastern Church—The Russian Church—The Patriarch Nicon—Peter the Great and the Modern Church of Russia.

SINAI AND PALESTINE;

IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR HISTORY. By Dean STANLEY. With Plans. 8vo. 14*s.*

CONTENTS.

Connection of Sacred History and Sacred Geography—Egypt in relation to Israel—Peninsula of Sinai—Palestine—The Heights and Passes of Benjamin—Ephraim—The Maritime Plain—Jordan and the Dead Sea—Peræa—Plain of Esdraelon—Galilee—Sources of Jordan—Lebanon, and Anti-Lebanon—The Gospel History—The Holy Places.

[*Continued.*

HISTORY OF THE JEWS,

FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO MODERN TIMES. By the late Dean **MILMAN.** 3 vols. post 8vo. 18*s.*

CONTENTS.

The Patriarchal Age—Israel in Egypt—The Desert—The Invasion—The Conquest—The Judges—The Monarchy—Judah and Israel—The High Priests—The Asmonæans—Herod—The Herodian Family—The Roman Governors—Preparations for the War—The War—Siege of Jerusalem—Termination of the War—Barochab—The Patriarch of the West, and the Prince of the Captivity—Judaism and Christianity—Judaism and Mahommedanism—Golden Age and Iron Age of Judaism—Jews in England—Jews expelled from Spain—Jews of Italy—Modern Judaism.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY,

FROM THE BIRTH OF CHRIST TO THE EXTINCTION OF PAGANISM IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By the late Dean **MILMAN.** 3 vols. post 8vo. 18*s.*

CONTENTS.

The Life of Christ—Christianity and Judaism—Christianity and Paganism—Constitution of Christian Churches—Marcus Aurelius the Philosopher—Persecution under Diocletian—Constantine and his Sons—Trinitarian Controversy—Julian—Abolition of Paganism—The Great Prelates of the East and West—Jerome and the Monastic System—Public Spectacles—Christian Literature—Christianity and the Fine Arts.

HISTORY OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY,

INCLUDING THAT OF THE POPES TO THE PONTIFICATE OF NICHOLAS V. By Dean **MILMAN.** 9 vols. post 8vo. 54*s.*

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

FROM THE APOSTOLIC TIMES TO THE REFORMATION, 1517. By Canon **ROBERTSON, M.A.** 8 vols. post 8vo. 6*s.* each.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF FRANCE,

FROM THE CONCORDAT OF BOLOGNA, 1516, TO THE REVOLUTION. With an Introduction. By Rev. **W. H. JERVIS, M.A.** Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo. 28*s.*

MISSIONARY TRAVELS IN ASIA MINOR.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS OF BIBLICAL HISTORY AND ARCHÆOLOGY. By Rev. **H. J. VAN LENNEP.** With Map and Woodcuts. 2 vols. post 8vo. 24*s.*

MODERN CUSTOMS AND MANNERS OF BIBLE LANDS IN ILLUSTRATION OF SCRIPTURE.

By Rev. **H. J. VAN LENNEP.** With Coloured Maps and 300 Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. 21*s.*

[*Continued.*

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018